



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 51631 2



**PRESENTED BY  
THE PUBLISHER**

LD

817

.B8









# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—St. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---



VOLUME XX, 1914

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.



# CONTENTS OF VOL. XX, 1914

## MAIN ARTICLES.

	PAGE
The Seventh Centenary of Roger Bacon (1214-1914)—Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.....	3
Some Limitations of Relief—William J. Kerby.....	10
Scott's Catholic Tendencies—John E. Graham.....	29
The Congested Districts in Ireland—Frank O'Hara.....	50
Intellectualism in Practical Life—C. A. Dubray.....	91
Luther in the Light of Facts—Lucian Johnston.....	103
Peasant Proprietorship in Ireland—John O'Grady.....	125
From John Stuart Mill to William James—P. B. Vogt, O. F. M.....	139
Constantinople and Civilization—Patrick J. Healy.....	183
The Minimum Wage—Edwin V. O'Hara.....	200
Dryden as a Prose Writer—Brother Leo, F. S. C.....	211
Eugenics: Fundamental Principles—John Webster Melody.....	224
The Morality of Interest on Capital—John A. Ryan.....	263
The Malthusian Principle of Population—Frank O'Hara.....	278
The Personality of Francis Thompson—Florence Moynihan.....	296
The Philosophy of Henry Bergson—C. A. Dubray.....	302
The Social Justification of Interest on Capital—John A. Ryan.....	337
Labour Exchanges in Great Britain and Ireland—P. J. Lennox.....	352
Chateaubriand and the American Indian—Elbridge Colby.....	374
The Malthusian Principle of Population, II—Frank O'Hara.....	388
How the Three Thousand were Converted—C. F. Cremin.....	425
Legal Literature among the Arabic-Speaking Churches—Franz J. Coeln.....	443
Shelley and Francis Thompson—Florence Moynihan.....	457
Pelagianism in Ireland—Patrick J. Temple.....	463
Pius the Tenth—Thomas J. Shahan.....	501
Vladimir Solovev and His Theories on the Religious Dissension Between the East and the West—F. A. Palmieri.....	505
The "Son of Man"; A Prophecy Unfulfilled—Thomas A. K. O'Reilly, O. P.....	523
"Ethna Carbery"; A Woman Who Loved Ireland—Elbridge Colby....	533
Washington, His Allies and His Friends—Charles H. McCarthy.....	576
The Dependence of St. Jerome on Origen—J. L. Weidenhan, S. T. L....	594
Newman's Sermons and the English Catholic Revival—John E. Graham	606

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Knights of Columbus Endowment Fund.....	73
Historical Sketch of the <i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>	240



	PAGE
Unveiling of Bust of Cardinal Gibbons at the Catholic University of America.....	414
The Judge John M. Mitchell Memorial Law Library.....	416
Basselin College: A New University Foundation for Ecclesiastics.....	419
Commencement Exercises, 1914.....	491, 559
Apostolic Letter of Our Holy Father, the Late Pope Pius X, in Favor of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.....	556
The New Sisters' College.....	557
Consecration of Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan as Bishop of Germani-copolis.....	659
University Chronicle.....	84, 180, 258, 332, 421, 498, 567, 673

## BOOK REVIEWS.

Abel, F. M.—Bethléem .....	481
Abel, F. M.—Une croisière autour de la Mer Morte.....	483
Allard, Paul—Les esclaves chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'Eglise jusqu' à la fin de la domination romaine en Occident..	69
Barker, Ernest—The Dominican Order and Convocation.....	175
Batifol, Mgr.—L'Eucharistie: la Présence Réelle et la Transubstantiation.....	171
Baumgartner, A., S. J.—Goethe. Sein Leben und Seine Werke.....	651
Belser—Johannes Evangelium.....	640
Bizzari, Romualdo—Studi sull' Estetica.....	549
Cameron, Mary Lovett—Umbria, Past and Present.....	71
Cecilia, Madame—From the Sepulchre to the Throne.....	639
Cecilia, Madame—Looking on Jesus, the Lamb of God.....	67
Conférences de Saint-Etienne.....	483
Cours de doctrine et de pratique sociale. X. seas.....	630
D'Alès, A.—Dictionnaire Apologétique de la foi catholique, Fasc. IX.....	176, 646
D'Alès, A.—L'Edit de Calliste.....	70
Dawson, C. B., S. J.—The Mirror of Oxford.....	326
Dierkins, F. Ignatius—The Morning Watch. Translation Edited by F. Elder Mullan.....	178
Engelhardt, Zephyrin—The Missions and Missionaries of California...	545
Falconio, Card. D.—I Minori Riformati negli Abruzzi.....	553
Foreman, S. E.—Advanced American History.....	329
Gallagher, Rev. T. P. F.—Searching the Scriptures.....	242
Gasquet, Francis A.—Breaking with the Past.....	637
Gemelli, Agostino O. M.—L'Enigma della Vita, e i nuovi orizzonti della biologia.....	550
Gerard, Thomas J.—Bergson, an Exposition and Criticism.....	239
Gibergues, Mgr. de—Faith: Sermons Preached at a Men's Retreat...	489
Guilday, Rev. Peter—The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795, Vol. I.....	627
Hagen, Martin—Realia Biblica Geographica, Naturalia, Archæologica, quibus Compendium Introductionis Completur et Illustratur	632

	PAGE
Hamerle, Rev. Andrew—Religious Indifference: A Lenten Course.....	489
Heikel, Dr. Ivan A.—Eusebius Werke, Sechster Band, "De Demonstratione Evangelica".....	168
Helm, Dr. Rudolf—Eusebius Werke, Siebenter Band, "Die Chronik des Hieronymus".....	170
Hitchcock, George S.—The First Twelve Chapters of Isaiah: A new translation and comment.....	543
Holder-Egger, Oswaldus—Chronica Fratris Salimbene Ordinis Minorum, Edidit Oswaldus Holder-Egger.....	403
Holland, Rev. Cornelius—The Divine Twilight.....	174
Hudal, Alois—Die religiösen und sittlichen Ideen des Spruchbuches...	542
Johns, C. H. W.—Ancient Babylonia.....	642
Keyser, Clarence E.—Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan.....	632
Knabenbauer, Joseph—Commentarii in St. Pauli Epistolas ad Thessalonicenses, ad Timotheum ad Titum et ad Philemonem.....	641
Kötschau, Dr. Paul—Origenes Werke, Fünfter Band "De Principiis".....	166
Lagrange, M. J.—Saint Justin.....	484
Lanslots, D. I.—Spiritism Unveiled.....	66
Lattcy, Rev. Cuthbert—The Westminster Version of the Scriptures...	633
La Vassière, J. de, S. J.—Philosophia Naturalis.....	174
Lemonyer, A.—La Révélation primitive et les données actuelles de la science, d'après l'ouvrage allemand de R. P. G. Schmidt.....	242
Lepin, M.—Jésus Christ, Sa vie et son oeuvre.....	67
Lesêtre, Henri—Le temple de Jérusalem.....	637
Livingston, Rev. Wm.—Poems by Loyal Hearts.....	655
Long, William J.—American Literature.....	649
Marist Brothers—American Catholic Hymnal.....	411
Martin, C. A.—Catholic Religion, a Statement of Christian Teaching and History.....	488
Martinez, F.—L'Ascetisme chrétien pendant les trois premiers siècles de l'Eglise.....	408
de Mathies, Dr. Paul—Predigten und Ansprachen zunächst für die jugend gebildeter Stände.....	638
Meagher, Rev. J. L.—The Protestant Churches.....	629
Mearns, James M. A.—Early Latin Hymnaries.....	412
McLaren du Tiers, Miss Agnes—Ordre de St. Dominique, Docteur en Médecine.....	485
Moore, C. H.—The Mediæval Church Architecture of England.....	324
Moran, Rev. W.—The Government of the Church in the First Century,	69
O'Connell, C. J.—The Catholic Church the True Church of the Bible..	65
O'Hagan, T.—In the Heart of the Meadow and other Poems.....	656
O'Hara, F.—Unemployment in Oregon.....	648
Palou, Francisco—Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra, founder of the Franciscan Missions of California .....	239
Pègues, O. P.—Commentaire français littéral de la Somme Théologique de St. Thomas d'Aquin.....	246

	PAGE
Peladan, M.—S. Francis of Assisi.....	413
Poey, M. le Chanoine P.—Manuel de Sociologie Catholique, d'après les documents pontificaux.....	630
Pope, Hugh—The Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible.....	634
Rauschen, Gerhard—Eucharist and Penance in the First Six Centuries of the Church.....	172
Regesto dell' Antica Badia de S. Matteo de Castello o Servorum Dei.....	410
Revue Lacordaire, Vol. I, 1913.....	486
Richards, Henry Livingston—A Loyal Life: A Biography of Henry Livingston Richards.....	68
S. T. B.—Archbishop Smith and the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch. Compiled by S. T. B.....	178
Schumacher, Heinrich—Christus in seiner Praeexistenz und Kenose nach Phil. 2, 5-8.....	541
Schuyler, Henry C., S. T. L.—Le Courage du Christ.....	327
Schuyler, Henry C., S. T. L.—A Divine Friend.....	327
Sisters of the Visitation, Wilmington, Del.—Life and Characteristics of the Right Rev. Alfred A. Curtis, D. D., second Bishop of Wilmington, Del.....	407
Smith, John Talbot—The Black Cardinal.....	658
Taylor, H. O.—The Mediæval Mind.....	554
United States Catholic Historical Society—Historical Records and Studies, Vol. VIII.....	643
Vaudon, J.—La Crèche, La Croix, L'Autel.....	489
Vincent, H. et Abel, T. M.—Bethléem.....	481
Vincent, H. et Abel, T. M.—Jérusalem.....	481
Vonier, Dom A.—The Human Soul.....	487
Waninger, Dr. K.—Der sozial Katholizismus in England.....	551
Wiener, H. W.—Pentateuchal Studies.....	642
Williams, T. D.—Half-Hour with God's Heroes, or Stories from the Sacred Books.....	639

## GENERAL INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
America, History of.....	320	Dependent Classes.....	15
American Literature.....	649	Dominicans.....	175
Apologetics.....	176, 646	Dryden as Prose Writer.....	211
Arabic, Legal Literature in.....	443	Economics and Charity.....	14
Architecture, Medieval.....	325	England, Catholic Revival in..	606
Asceticism in Early Church...	408	England, Catholic Social	
Babylonia, Ancient.....	642	Activity in.....	551
Babylonian Records.....	632	England, Labor Exchanges in..	352
Bacon, Roger.....	3	English Catholic Refugees....	627
Baptism in Early Church.....	434	Esthetics.....	549
Basselin College.....	419	Ethna Carbery.....	533
Benedict XV, Pope.....	503	Eucharist and Penance.....	172
Bergson, Philosophy of...	239, 302	Eucharist, Real Presence in...	171
Bethlehem, Sanctuary of.....	481	Eugenics, Fundamental	
Bible, Aids to.....	634	Principles of.....	224
Bible and Church.....	65	Eusebius, Works of.....	168
Bible, Archeology of.....	632	Falconio, Cardinal.....	553
Bible, Luther and.....	105	Family, State and.....	227
Bible, Westminster Version of.	633	Francis of Assisi, Saint....	71, 413
Biology, New Horizons of...	550	Franciscans, Oxford.....	3
California, Missions in.....	545	Gasquet, Cardinal.....	87, 637
Callixtus, Edict of.....	70	Gibbons, Cardinal 76, 333, 414,	556
Capital, Interest on.....	263, 337	Gibbons Hall.....	180
Catholicity in England.....	551	Goethe.....	651
Catholics in American		Gothic Architecture.....	324
Revolution.....	584	Hayes, Bishop.....	497
Chabot, Dr.....	249	Humanism, Luther and.....	109
Charity and Thrift.....	12	Hume, David.....	141
Chateaubriand.....	374	Hymnal, Catholic.....	411
Chemical Laboratory.....	497	Hymnaries, Latin.....	412
Christ, Courage of.....	327	Ignatius, Saint, Spiritual	
Christology.....	541	Exercises of.....	178
Church, Government of, in First		Index, Roman.....	177
Centuries.....	69	Indian, American.....	374
Church in Russia.....	505	Industries in Ireland.....	61
Church, True, of Bible.....	65	Inquisition.....	177
Civilization, Constantinople and	183	Intellectualism.....	91
Columbus, Journal of.....	320	Interest on Capital.....	263, 337
Conduct, Knowledge and.....	97	Ireland, Congested Districts in	50
Constantine the Great.....	183	Ireland, Ethna Carbery and...	533
Constantinople and Civilization	183	Ireland, Labor Exchanges in..	352
Conversion.....	425	Ireland, Peasant	
Coptic Manuscripts.....	255	Proprietorship in.....	125
<i>Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium</i>	248	Ireland, Pelagianism in.....	463
Curtis, Bishop.....	407	Isaiah, New Translation of...	543
Defectives, Care of.....	233	James, William.....	139

	PAGE		PAGE
Jenkins, Michael.....	415	Population, Checks to	
Jerome, Saint.....	594	Increase of.....	288
Jerusalem, Temple of.....	637	Population, Theories of....	278, 338
Jerusalem, Topography of....	481	Pragmatism.....	151
Jesuits in California.....	241	Progress, Luther and.....	107
Jesus Christ, Life of.....	67	Prose, Dryden's.....	211
John, Saint, Gospel of.....	640	Protestant Churches.....	629
Justin, Saint.....	484	Proverbs, Book of.....	542
Keane, Archbishop.....	259	Pugin, Augustus Welby.....	95
Knights of Columbus.....	73	Reformation, English.....	637
Knights of Columbus		Reformation, Luther and....	103
Scholarships.....	259	Relief, Limitations of.....	10
Knowledge and Conduct.....	97	Revelation and Science.....	242
Labor Exchanges.....	352	Revolution, American.....	579
Labor Legislation in Oregon..	203	Revolution, American,	
Lacordaire.....	486	Catholics in.....	584
Land, Tenure of, in Ireland... 129		Richards, Henry Livingston... 68	
Law Library.....	417	Roman Empire under	
Livingston, Rev. William.....	655	Constantine.....	188
Logic in Practical Life.....	92	Russian Church.....	505
Luther in Light of Facts.....	103	<i>Salimbene, Chronicles of</i> .....	403
Malthus on Population.....	278	Scott, Walter, and Catholicity. 29	
Malthusian Theory.....	279	Sermons.....	638
Malthusian Theory of		Sermons, Newman's.....	606
Population.....	388	Serra, Father Junipero.....	239
Medievalism.....	555	Shahan, Bishop.....	497, 567, 650
Metaphysics, Bergson's.....	313	Shaw, Bernard.....	225
Middle Ages.....	554	Shelley and Thompson.....	457
Mill, John Stuart.....	139	Sisters' College.....	557
Minimum Wage.....	201	Slavery in Early Church.....	69
Missions in California.....	545	Social Life of First Christians. 437	
Mitchell, Judge John M.....	417	Social Work.....	20
Morgan, J. Pierpont.....	257, 632	Sociology, Catholic.....	630
Newman's Sermons.....	606	Solovev, Vladimir.....	505
Oregon, Labor Legislation in..	203	Soul, The Human.....	487
Oregon, Unemployment in....	648	Spiritism.....	66
Origen and St. Jerome.....	594	<i>Summa Theologica</i> .....	246
Origen, Works of.....	166	Temperance in America.....	87
Oxford.....	3	Temperance in Europe.....	332
<i>Oxford, Mirror of</i> .....	326	Thomas of Aquin, Saint.....	246
Palestine.....	483	Thompson, Francis.....	296
Paul, Saint, Epistles of.....	641	Thompson, Francis, and Shelley 457	
Pelagianism in Ireland.....	453	Transubstantiation.....	171
Penance and Eucharist.....	172	Umbria, St. Francis in.....	71
Pentateuch, Authorship of... 178		United States Catholic	
Pentateuch, Studies in.....	642	Historical Society.....	643
Philosophy, English.....	142	Universities, Catholic.....	646
Philosophy, Natural.....	174	Wage, Minimum.....	201
Philosophy of Bergson.....	302	Washington, George.....	576
Pius X, Pope.....	601	Wiseman, Cardinal.....	621

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*January, 1914.*

*No. 1.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—*St. VINCENT OF LERINS, Commonit., c. 6.*

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.



**J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XX.*

*January, 1914.*

---

*No. 1.*

## THE SEVENTH CENTENARY OF ROGER BACON (1214-1914).

---

The seventh centenary of the birth of Roger Bacon (1214-1914), which it is intended to commemorate this year, has an interest far outside of Franciscan circles. No doubt, Bacon's fame rests chiefly on the fact that he was the champion of experimental science and the advocate of positive knowledge at a time when logic reigned supreme and the great Humboldt does not hesitate to call him from this point of view "the most important phenomenon of the Middle Ages." At the same time, it has been truly said of Bacon that, like his famous namesake in the sixteenth century, "he took all knowledge as his province, and rarely touched a subject which he did not illuminate. His works range over theology and biblical criticism, metaphysics, moral and political philosophy, the study of languages and comparative philology, mathematics, physics, astronomy and astrology, chronology, geography, chemistry and alchemy, botany, medicine and magic: and throughout his writings are scattered criticisms of the state of learning and education in his time, and suggestions for the application of scientific theories to practical inventions. The memory of the Oxford Franciscan appeals, therefore, not only to the historian, but also to the theologian, the philosopher, the philologist, the mathematician, the man of science, the physician, and the educationalist; while his importance in the history of gunpowder, his anticipation of

flying machines and the influence which his geographical treatise exercised on the discovery of America, may interest a yet larger public.”<sup>1</sup>

Certain it is, in any event, that at the present time the works of Bacon are being studied within a growing circle with an ever enhanced appreciation of their importance. In this connexion it may be worthy of mention that a number of distinguished British scholars have recently united in forming a “Roger Bacon Commemoration Committee” with a view to celebrating the coming Septingentenary in a manner worthy of the “Doctor Mirabilis,” as he was called, whose chief misfortune it was, in Parkinson’s words, “to be more penetrating than the common rank of Doctors.”<sup>2</sup> Of this Committee Earl Curzon of Kedleston, Chancellor of the University of Oxford is Honorary President, and among those who have joined it are Lord Rayleigh, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, the Earl of Rosebery, Chancellor of the Universities of London and Glasgow, the Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh and former Prime Minister, the Archbishop of York, Abbot Gasquet, Sir Archibald Giekie, President of the Royal Society, Sir A. W. Ward, President of the British Academy, Sir Oliver Lodge, Professor Sir William Osler and Canon Hastings Rashdall, the historian of the Mediæval Universities. Under the auspices, then, of this representative Committee a “Roger Bacon Commemoration” is to be held at Oxford next June when a statue of Bacon (by Mr. Hope Pinker) will be unveiled in the National History Museum there. On this occasion addresses will be given by well-known speakers. It is proposed, moreover, to issue, in connection with this Commemoration, a memorial volume of essays dealing with various aspects of Roger Bacon’s work written by specialists in the various subjects.

But the coming Bacon Septingentenary Celebration is intended to do more than serve the principal purpose such cele-

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from the Circular of the “Roger Bacon Commemoration Committee.”

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica* (London, 1728), p. 112.

brating usually serve, which is to make the general public better acquainted with the life work and character of the celebrity whom it is meant to honor. Indeed, it may be said that the chief end which the Committee has in view in celebrating this Centenary is to arrange for the editing and printing of Roger Bacon's writings, and, from the standpoint of the student, doubtless the most interesting and important item in the whole programme is the announcement that the publication of these works has already been undertaken by an Editorial Sub-Committee consisting of Messrs. J. P. Gibson, Keeper of the MSS., British Museum, F. Madan, Bodley's Librarian, and A. G. Little, author of "The Grey Friars in Oxford" with Professor F. Picavet, of the Collège de France as foreign corresponding member. Nor is this all. The first volume of this Centenary edition of Bacon's writings is now in the press. It will contain his unpublished treatise and commentary on the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secretum Secretorum*, edited by Mr. Robert Steele, who has already edited the old English versions of the *Secretum* and several of Bacon's previously unpublished works. The second volume will probably contain the medical treatises, an edition of which is being prepared by Dr. E. T. Withington and Mr. A. G. Little. Other volumes should contain a complete edition of the *Opus Tertium* (fragments of which were printed in 1859, 1909, and 1912): the *Quaestiones* on Aristotle's Physics and Metaphysics, and on the *De Plantis*; the *Communia Mathematicae*, and perhaps the *Computus Naturalium*; while new and critical editions of the *Opus Majus*, of the fragmentary *Opus Minus*, and of the less important *De Naturis Metallorum* and *Tractatus Trium Verborum* are desirable.

The labor of preparing these new editions has, doubtless, been somewhat lightened by the recent upgrowth of scholarly interest in Baconian studies. This interest has shown itself in the twofold form of provisional editions of some of Bacon's writings, and of original studies dealing with different aspects of his work. In particular, the publications of Bridges,<sup>2</sup> Nolan

<sup>2</sup> The "*Opus Majus*" of Roger Bacon, edited by John Henry Bridges,

and Hirsch,<sup>4</sup> Steele,<sup>5</sup> Duhern,<sup>6</sup> Witzel,<sup>7</sup> Rashdall,<sup>8</sup> and Little<sup>9</sup> together with learned criticisms of these publications by Dr. Hugo Höver<sup>10</sup> and Fr. Michael Behl,<sup>11</sup> to name no others, have helped considerably to prepare the way for an edition of Bacon's works which fulfils modern requirements. But although a great deal has lately been done in this direction by instalments, so to say, much still remains to be accomplished before we can expect an edition of Bacon worthy to rank with the Quaracchi edition of the works of St. Bonaventure.<sup>12</sup>

Those who have not given time and thought to the study of Roger Bacon will hardly be able to realize how difficult it is to compile even a satisfactory bibliography of his writings.

London, 1900, 2 Vols. in 8°. Vol. I, pp. clxxxvii + 404: Vol. II, pp. xv + 568. Together with a supplementary volume containing corrections and emendations, issued the same year.

<sup>4</sup> *The Greek Grammar of Roger Bacon*, etc. Edited from the mss. by Edm. Nolan and S. A. Hirsch, Cambridge, 1902, in 8°, pp. lxxxvi + 212.

<sup>5</sup> *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*. Edidit Rob. Steele in 8°. Fasc. I (London, 1905), pp. viii + 50. Fasc. II, (Oxford, 1910,) pp. xvi + 137. Fasc. III, (Oxford, 1911,) pp. iv + 137-308.

<sup>6</sup> *Un fragment inédit de l'Opus tertium de Roger Bacon*, etc., par Pierre Duhem, Quaracchi, 1909 in 8°, pp. 199.

<sup>7</sup> *De Fr. Rogero Bacon ejusque sententia de rebus bibliis*. Two articles by Fr. Theophilus Witzel, O. F. M., in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* III (1910), fasc. I, pp. 9-22 and fasc. II, pp. 185-213. See also the same writer's admirable article on Bacon in the *Cath. Encyclopedia*, Vol. XIII, s. v. Roger, pp. 111-116.

<sup>8</sup> *Fratris Rogeri Bacon Compendium Studii Theologiae*. Edidit H. Rashdall, una cum appendice: *De operibus Rogeri Bacon*, edita per A. G. Little, Aberdeen, 1911 in 8°, pp. 118. (British Society of Franciscan Studies, Vol. III.)

<sup>9</sup> *Part of the "Opus Tertium" of Roger Bacon, including a fragment now published for the first time*. Aberdeen, 1912, in 8°, pp. xlviii + 99. (British Society of Franciscan Studies, Vol. IV.)

<sup>10</sup> *Roger Bacon*, par P. Dr. Hugo Höver, O. Cist., in *Etudes Franciscaines*, XXVI, 152 (Aug. 1911), pp. 199 ff.

<sup>11</sup> See *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, (vi-iii) (July, 1913), Bibliographia, p. 559 ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Doctors Seraphici S. Bonaventurae S. R. E. Episcopi Cardinalis Opera Omnia*, edita studio et cura P. P. Collegii S. Bonaventurae in fol. ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi), 1882-1902. Any scientific study of Bonaventure must be based upon this edition, in the preparation of which the editors visited over 400 libraries and examined nearly 52,000 mss.; the first volume alone contains 20,000 variant readings.

Leland's well-known saying, "that it is easier to collect the leaves of the Sibyl than the titles of the works of Bacon," has lately been quoted with approval by Little, who points out that the difficulty of the task "is partly due to Bacon's habit of re-writing his treatises four or five times before he could get a satisfactory version, and to his using the same material over and over again in different connexions." As a consequence, "the same works recur with different titles and different *incipits*, and different works with the same title; and the number of fragments and unfinished works is enormous."<sup>13</sup> Then again, while, on the one hand, some genuine writings of Bacon are still hidden under other names, he has, on the contrary, got the credit of many others that are certainly not his. A valuable clue to this labyrinth of Baconian study is furnished by Little's new Bibliography of Bacon,<sup>14</sup> which is a very positive asset. The task of introducing order into the immense amount of material in manuscript as well as in printed form bearing upon the subject cannot have been an easy one, and the author of *The Grey Friars in Oxford* is to be heartily congratulated on the success with which he has accomplished it. Thanks to this bibliography we are now in a position to correct and control the lists of Bacon's works given by Bale,<sup>15</sup> Wadding<sup>16</sup> and others which, viewed in the light of recent researches, are very imperfect in so far as they include spurious works and omit genuine ones.

A comparison of Little's bibliography, however, with those given by earlier writers tends, on the whole, to confirm the authority of the bulk of the works generally attributed to Bacon. Some, indeed, of the treatises of minor importance formerly ascribed to Bacon, notably certain works on alchemy, are now with greater

<sup>13</sup> See Little, Bibliography in appendix to Rashdall's *Compendium* already mentioned, note 8, p. 71.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 72-112. This bibliography is based on the account of Bacon's works given in *The Grey Friars at Oxford* (Oxford, 1892), p. 195-211.

<sup>15</sup> *Index Britanniae Scriptorum quos . . . collegit Joan. Balaeus*, edited by R. L. Poole and M. Bateson (Oxford, 1902).

<sup>16</sup> *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum recensuit Fr. Lucas Wadding*. Edit. III, (Rome, 1906), pp. 206-208.



probability attributed to other writers. But, if modern research has taken away from Bacon certain works hitherto assigned to him, like the *Epistola de Magnete*, which is now accredited to Peter de Maricourt,<sup>17</sup> it has in return given him back others such as the *Speculum Astronomiae*, a work which had in the course of time come to be attributed to Albertus Magnus.<sup>18</sup> And these are but two of several instances of the same sort. Very likely one or more of the works of doubtful authenticity, like the *Tractatus in Psalterium* hitherto accredited to Roger Bacon, should go to the credit of his namesake and kinsman Robert Bacon, O. P., who died in 1248.<sup>19</sup> Any one at all conversant with the vagaries of mediæval scribes will see how easily a slip might be made between the two names: everyone will see that it is much easier to transcribe an erroneous attribution of authorship on the good faith of some one else than to undertake a personal investigation as to its accuracy. It is for this reason that a mistake of this kind once made would be copied from one codex to another.

What concerns us more, however, than these considerations is the fact that, as a result of recent researches, we are now able to form a fairly accurate idea of how much Bacon actually committed to writing. But modern criticism has by no means said the last word as to the authenticity of the eighty writings and upwards which, since Bacon's time, have come to be attributed to him. No one familiar with the catalogues of the great libraries of Europe need be told that an enormous number of Bacon mss. are preserved in these libraries, especially in England, France, and Italy. The more important of these mss. are described by Little and others already mentioned. Not a few of them are either copies of works or portions of works already published and are, therefore, deserving of no further

<sup>17</sup> See paper by Silvanus P. Thompson read before the British Academy, 28 Nov. 1906. (*Proceedings of the Brit. Acad.* II.)

<sup>18</sup> It is printed among the works of Albertus Magnus: *Opera Omnia* (Ed. Boignet, Paris, 1891), t. x, p. 629 f., but is ascribed to Roger Bacon by Fr. Mandonnet, O. P., in "Roger Bacon et le *Speculum Astronomiae*" in *Revue Néo-Scholastique de Philosophie*, xvii (August, 1910), pp. 313-335.

<sup>19</sup> See *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Paris edition, 1719), Vol. I, p. 118.

examination. But there are other Bacon mss. which should be examined and reported on by competent scholars. For, it is to be observed, that not all the Bacon mss. have yet been discovered. Some have, perhaps, long lain hidden in remote convent libraries, or else they may be mouldering in obscurity among a pile of ms. "spoils" in unexplored communal archives. However this may be, a number of vital Bacon documents are still unprinted. And, further, there are certain texts to be edited and others again that need re-editing. What is more, there are several chapters in the life of Bacon that still wait to be written; so far, indeed, no modern, comprehensive, scientific biography of the "Doctor Mirabilis," exists and one is wanted.<sup>20</sup> It may be doubted, however, whether such a work could be produced at present owing to the lack of a complete and critical edition of Bacon's writings, the fact being that Bacon's own writings are, after all, the source whence our knowledge of his life is chiefly derived.

In view, then, of these considerations it is earnestly to be hoped that the work of editing and printing Roger Bacon's writings already undertaken by the Centenary Commemoration Committee may not be delayed or hindered by any want of co-operation. It is clear, at the same time, that this work can only be carried on as far as funds will allow.<sup>21</sup> Probably it will be impossible to carry out the whole of the programme proposed by the Committee without the help of a Roger Bacon Society. Apart from this consideration, the establishment of such a society ought surely to be one of the results of the coming Septingentenary Celebration.

FR. PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

<sup>20</sup> In the absence of such a work the best extant biography of Bacon is, perhaps, that of Charles: *Roger Bacon, Sa vie, ses ouvrages, ses doctrines*, Paris, 1861.

<sup>21</sup> It may, perhaps, conveniently be noted here that subscriptions toward the Centenary fund will be gratefully acknowledged by the Committee. Subscriptions should be sent to the Secretary, Lieut.-Colonel Hime, 20 West Park Road, Kew, London, England. Subscribers of one guinea and upwards will be entitled to receive a copy of the memorial volume issued in connection with the Centenary celebration.

## **SOME LIMITATIONS OF RELIEF.**

---

There are too many poor in the world. There are too few who are willing to work among them in order to improve their condition. Some among these who are willing to do that work fail to accomplish adequate results because of mistaken views and standards on which they base their methods. The labors of the wise friends of the poor are seriously interfered with through lack of money. Funds are always inadequate to the work of relief.

There are great social processes at work which cause and perpetuate poverty. There are processes in poverty which intensify its action and increase geometrically its power of devastation and the difficulty of redeeming the poor from its thralldom. There are other social processes which so affect imagination and divert sympathies as to prevent multitudes among the stronger classes from realizing their duties toward the poor. There are other processes which permit the friends of the poor to drift into mistaken impressions about poverty and to be governed by them in their efforts for relief. There are still other social processes which so affect the current judgment of money and of its uses as to prevent it from coming spontaneously and in sufficient quantities to finance the restoration of our unfortunate classes. Some are beyond a doubt, poor through their own fault. Some are indifferent to the poor through a deliberate judgment for which they may be blamed. Some of the friends of the poor love their notions of relief work more than they love the poor, and sacrifice the interests of the latter in order to have the satisfaction of indulging in the former. Many of those who refuse to contribute to relief work do so with deliberation. But after all allowances have been made for guilt in everyone of these lines, we discover that vast social processes enter vitally into the situation and determine to a very great extent the limitations under which work for the poor will be carried on.

Ignorance of the poor and of their poverty is found everywhere. Relatively more of it is found among the cultured and powerful than among the more modest classes of society. This ignorance sets a fundamental limitation on the resources available for relief work. In many circles into which knowledge of poverty has penetrated, mistaken views concerning its facts and processes arrest practically every impulse that might lead to service. These mistaken views lead the strong to blame the poor for their poverty and cause the formation of a stern individualism which teaches that if the poor are poor by their own fault, they must rise by their own efforts. Such mistaken interpretations place a second fundamental limitation of the resources of charity. Problems of organization, of analysis and of coördination of resources, also place distressing limitations in our way. But each of these is conspicuous. There is little difficulty in locating it and in tracing its action. There are, however, many minor factors which set limitations to relief work and usually escape attention because they are elusive and difficult of definition. Some of them are noted in these pages.

## I

The stronger social classes are those whose members have sufficient income to allow some surplus after specific obligations in life have been satisfied. We may include those who have sufficient education and leisure to permit them to undertake some form of social service in a spirit of unselfishness, if they wish to do so. The weaker classes are those in general who have no income or an insufficient and uncertain one; those also who have an existence income but who obtain it at a cost to health, to child life or to home life which does fundamental harm to society. Our problem is to find out the less obvious but none the less effective elements which hinder the strong from doing their duty, and also to discover the elements among the weak which limit the effectiveness of social service undertaken in their behalf.

The strong are harassed by economic and social fear. There

is an inherent instability in modern life due to the risks of business, to the stress of competition, to uncertainty in employment and in income. Fear of reduction in salary, fear of loss of position, fear of risk in the investment of savings, increased demands of social life, increased cost of living without corresponding improvement in income, are sources of perpetual worry to the great middle class. This fear enters profoundly into the determination of motives and of decisions in spending money and in saving it. It affects thereby the performance of all of those duties which are conditioned in one way or another by money. Many in the middle class seek refuge against this economic and social fear in various forms of insurance. Others aim simply to accumulate a surplus and to invest it in either a home or in securities of one kind or another. Others save in anticipation of the responsibilities of the education of children. Others acquire in some mysterious way, an alert fear of dependence in sickness or in old age or in accident. Throughout all of the circles in which this economic fear operates, we find a permanent effect of it in the understanding of duty and responsibility, in the expending of money and in general attitudes toward it. Imagination is governed by this chronic fear in varying degrees. Processes of feeling and the trend of sympathies obey it. Thrift is a virtue, saving is wisdom and foresight is a duty, just so long and only so long as they are balanced in their place in our whole Christian view of life. When economic fear disturbs our judgment and exerts its subtle and approved tyranny over us, it hurts our broader sense of duty. Nowhere else is the effect of this fear more evident than in the views of charity taken often by the well-to-do. It would be difficult to reach an accurate estimate of the extent to which it is the case. Such a determination is, however, not necessary. Our immediate purpose is served in listing economic fear as one of the factors in our atmosphere which hinder men from a clear understanding of the relations of the strong and the weak, that is, of the well to do and the poor.

Conscious but aimless social striving is another of the factors referred to. We meet very few who are not compelled to live

### *LIMITATIONS OF RELIEF*

in friendly relations with others who have a higher income. Those of lesser means are forced into a style of life which is beyond them. When we make social comparisons we look upwards with envy to the class next above us, and rarely to the class next below us with any feeling of satisfied joy. A habit of aimless social striving results and most of the practical judgments of everyday life are determined by the slavery of this striving rather than by intelligent judgment of our resources. The tyranny of keeping up appearances is so sustained and inexorable as to force us into the heroisms of martyrdom because we are not brave enough to be simple and to direct our lives in intelligent relation to all of our Christian duties. We rate money too highly when we look at those who have more of it than we have. We give it too low a rating when we sacrifice it in order to attain to "the insignificant social supremacies" around which our ambitions cluster. We force ourselves into the turmoil of struggle because we must maintain appearances with those to whom we look for standards and in whose approval and notice we set our fixed ambitions. This struggle so engages imagination, so directs the flow of sympathy and of interest and so absorbs income as to drive out of mind and out of life, the clarified spiritual judgment which would enable us to understand our duty toward poverty and the poor. The money spent at the dictates of useless social ambition seems insignificant in comparison with what we aim at socially. The same amount given to the poor under the command of Christ appears enormous and out of all proportion to our means. Indiscriminate social striving is one of the powers of Democracy, but it is also one of its dire confusions. The virtues and duties of one's "state in life" help wonderfully to moralize one, to bring peace and stability into ambition and action. But when one may aim at any "state in life" one is apt to lose in moral clearness and self-control. When one aims at the rights and recognitions of a higher social state, one may neglect the duties of one's "lower" state and be loser thereby.

Neither economic fear nor aimless social striving could blunt our sense of duty toward the poor, if we knew them well and



understood their lives. Our ignorance of poverty becomes, therefore, an important negative factor in limiting our willingness to serve the poor and in diverting our surplus energies and resources away from them. The geography of life separates us from the poor. Our social standing, the neighborhood in which we live, the companionships and tastes which determine the range of social life and experience, hinder us from entering into natural social relations with the poor. Any relationship into which we enter with them is apt to be reluctant, forced and artificial. And yet we are told uniformly that the value of relief work depends on a natural, unconstrained attitude toward those whom we serve. We and the poor speak different languages and look on life from entirely different points of view. The poor have their philosophy and we have ours. We shrink our sympathies to our own classes and the poor in self-defence shrink back from contact with us. We meet grown up men and women who have never come into personal contact with a single case of helpless poverty and who would remain confused and dumb were they to do so.

Even when we might enter into easy and natural relations with certain types of dependency we are not inclined to do so, or when so inclined we find it impracticable. Few of us possibly, pass a single day without being served in our economic life by children or by adults upon whose lives and hopes poverty has set its unmistakable mark. The newsboy, the grocer's man, the garbage man, the messenger boy, the express man, the cook and the laundress, very often carry in their hearts all of the worries of poverty and show in their faces the indellible and unmistakable evidences of its tyranny. Upon the faithful and regular services of these depend the appointed ways of life. Yet we rarely know them, speak with them, understand them or cheer them by our friendly interest or strengthen them by our wisdom. We are too remote from the poor in one sense and we are too near to them in another sense. Experience does not save us from the sway of our fear and our striving and we pass through life unredeemed from our mistaken views.

Atmosphere rather than facts is held in mind; the intangible

processes which leave their traces in our lives and judgments and even in our views of elementary social Christian duty. The tremendous volume of relief work carried on by the strong in the interest of the poor shows us, of course, the extent to which correct views of life do obtain. But we are accounting not for what is done but for what is not done. We are describing not those who do their duty toward the poor, but those who fail to do it.

In many instances, failure to do duty toward the dependent classes is the result of vagueness rather than of bad will. Many of those whom we are inclined to blame for doing so little in the fight against poverty are victims not so much of culpable indifference or of intention as of vagueness. They do not know what to do nor how nor when. If we have no taste for work among the poor, it is probable that we shall neglect them. The circumstances of life not only tend to prevent us from developing a taste for social service but also develop within us a positive distaste for it. There is no way of discovering or influencing the large number of men and women who have good will and sympathetic hearts, but are unwilling to work among the poor. They lack knowledge. They feel aversion. They regret their dislike of social service but are unable to overcome it. We are governed largely by taste in this field of action as we are in literature and art and music. Most men feel a fundamental reluctance against attempting to do what they can do but badly. There is a sense of agreeable egotism in doing anything which we can do well. If our talent lies in the direction of effective and sympathetic work among the poor, our sense of obligation toward them will be robust and the flow of our sympathy will be strong and undisturbed. On the other hand, if we feel an aversion for work among the poor, we shall be ingenious in finding ways to excuse ourselves from attempting it. The process of life, therefore, when it hinders the development of a taste for social service and of a talent for it, fixes new limitations on its volume and directs many lives away from it.

Thorough work for the poor is highly technical and expen-

sive. It is conditioned on skill and cost. Even personal service apart from income depends in last analysis on leisure, and leisure is conditioned by money. There are few charities which do not complain that more workers are needed. There are few which do not complain that they are hampered at every point by lack of funds. Effective work among the poor depends on training and experience, and on a wide range of information. It requires an insight into social processes and clearness of understanding, an alertness of sympathy and tactfulness, patience and consecration which many do not possess. Hence we are awakening to the realization of the need of organization, of instruction, of reading and reflection, of discussion and conference, of leadership and system in every large phase of relief and preventive work.

## II

There are certain mistaken views of the nature of charity which affect seriously the development of relief work. Many believe that charity is merely an "optional" virtue; that it is of counsel and not of precept. According to this view, one may or may not perform works of relief just as one chooses. It is a good thing to work among the poor but it is not a bad thing not to do so. This is, of course, a fundamental error. There is nothing in the reading of the gospel which permits us to believe that Christ intended charity to be an "optional" virtue. Aside altogether from its supernatural character, we must look upon charity and the institutions of charity as belonging to the integrity of social organization. Citizenship and culture, even enlightened self-interest, declare its place in society, apart from God's command. If strength remains unchastened by service of the poor and if weakness is unassisted and unrefined by touch with culture, both the strong and the weak are harmed by the resulting estrangement and the spirit of social unity is fundamentally harmed. However, our law is in the supernatural view. Charity is an integral part of the normal religious experience of the Christian because the decree of Christ makes it so. Our theologians discussed with elabo-

rate care centuries ago, the whole range of the duties of charity and these have been presented to us reënforced always by compelling sanctions. This "optional" view of charity is the natural outcome of our circumstances and of the practically complete estrangement which exists between us and the poor. It represents a false undersanding of the law of the gospel and a false interpretation of the natural mission of charity. It robs us of the finest fruits of genuine culture when it is established in our code of ethics.

There are those who believe that charity is merely an "occasional" virtue. According to this view, we are required to serve the poor only when chance brings us into contact with them. Charity is thus made to depend on the accident of observation or of chance information. If we know no poor; if we meet no poor; if we can contrive to keep out of their way, we tell ourselves that we are relieved of all duty of solicitude for them, and we are unashamed. This estimate of the meaning of charity relieves us of all duty of initiative, and permits us to drift along in our secluded circles free from the inconveniences of thinking of the poor except when they are present. There are, of course, occasions when the duty of charity takes on particular emphasis. There are emergencies when our obligation is specific and immediate. But widespread as the "occasional" view of charity is, it remains for all time mistaken and to the highest degree, misleading. Were we in ordinary, normal social contact with the poor this "occasional" view might approach the truth because occasions would be furnished to tax our resources and to test our strength. But the artificial arrangements of life which congregate the strong here and segregate the poor there, prevent us from such relations with the poor as would assure the performance of our duty in this way.

A modification of this error is found among those who never volunteer either contributions or personal service but who content themselves with giving money when asked. Unfortunately, a general lack of intelligent initiative on the part of the strong has led the friends of the poor into the creation of various devices of appeal in order to stimulate generosity and

arouse interest. Astounding commentary on the spirit of our civilization is found in the unholy methods to which we are compelled to resort in order to get the money of which there is always pressing need in social work. A noble sense of a noble duty always includes the initiative to do it. We are taught in our Christian traditions that prayer, fasting and almsgiving, that is, worship, self-discipline, and service, belong to the integrity of Christian life. Occasions may modify the forms and extent of all three, but not one of them may be made to depend upon occasions alone without harming our finer nature and misdirecting life.

A related error is found in a widespread inadequate view of what is meant by service of the poor. We are told sometimes that there is no need of research or of study or of interpretation and consultation in "doing charity." We hear it said that this work consists in feeding the hungry and in clothing the naked and not in keeping card catalogues, not in writing books, and giving lectures. All men think and judge in the terms of their own standards. When these standards are inadequate and false, judgments are wrong and methods are mistaken. Those who shut their minds against the wider view of poverty and fail to see its perspective, err rather in not seeing than in not doing, in not aiming to see and in refusing to see. There is a science of charity as exact and as exacting as the science of government itself. There is a method in charity as definite and as detailed as method in art, in music, in poetry, in eloquence or in education. There are processes of degradation in poverty that are as irresistible as the headlong rush of a torrent. There are complications which enter into the weakness and helplessness of the poor, into their lack of opportunity and their shiftlessness which must be studied and dealt with as skillfully as the engineer studies the lay of the land through which he builds a railroad. All of these unfortunate views of poverty and of relief cause double harm because they blind their partisans against the only view which can lead to the thorough-going redemption of the poor. Unwise philanthropy is the philanthropy of small standards quite as much as it is

the philanthropy of indiscriminate impulse. Unfortunately, these inadequate standards of relief work are often associated with very holy impulses and real consecration.

Where work for the poor is taken to be merely the giving of relief, we can not arouse the friends of the poor to take any interest in the wider social work on which so much depends. The victims of these small standards can not see social work in the light of Christ's charity. Movements to improve wage conditions, to clean out slums, to hinder the social ravages of disease, to secure playgrounds for children, to put an end to occupational diseases and industrial accidents or reduce them to a minimum, carry rich and holy inspiration about them, and yet the victims of narrow standards in relief work remain unconverted and untouched. Narrow views of relief work are undoubtedly often taken as the result of serious thought. But do we not sometimes shape our views in obedience to other factors. If we feel conscious of lack of ability to do social work well, are we apt to declare that it has nothing to do with charity? If we are too lazy to do it, are we not apt to argue in the same way? If we assume that all work beyond mere relief is not charity but something else, that assumption will tyrannize over everything we do.

Another error related to these inadequate standards, is due to a positive mistake concerning the nature of poverty itself. One is surprised to find so many who believe that the poor are to blame for their poverty and that the redemption of these is in their own hands. They will admit that cripples, the sick and defective may be personally blameless but the average adult or youth among the poor is blamed with unrelenting and indiscriminate severity for his poverty. Here we find the harsh individualism which stifles so many impulses toward social service. This view, of course, is born almost exclusively of the grossest ignorance concerning the facts and processes of poverty.

Elements like the foregoing are found in discouraging abundance in the atmosphere of the strong. They operate to hinder very large numbers from feeling any inclination or vigorous impulse toward social service. Fortunately, however, very

large numbers of the strong are carried past these obstacles and are brought happily to the thresholds of the poor to work among them. We may continue our study and aim to find out the limitations under which the work is carried on.

### III

Social work is the service of a spiritual ideal. The impulse out of which it springs is unselfish and refining. Everything about it is so much to be commended and the motives which regulate it are in themselves so far above suspicion that we are disposed to overlook some of the reserves under which effective work for the poor must be done. Familiarity with ideals tends to disturb our sense of limitations. Misunderstandings of the function of ideals no less than neglect of them has done its own harm in the history of the world. Idealists are apt to concentrate attention upon immediate consequences of social measures and to overlook the long logic by which all social changes are inexorably governed. Practical men who live in the selfish as distinct from the unselfish world, are disposed to emphasize the remoter consequences of social action and to exaggerate the obstacles in the way of immediate concrete measures. In last analysis the difference between the ages-old conflict of conservatism with radicalism is a struggle between short and long outlooks on life. Idealists such as social workers are, do not always display ideal judgment nor do they show ideal capacity for ideal social relations. Far from it. This is made more evident when we note the limitations under which social work must be done and the vicissitudes to which even the most noble aims are subjected.

The limitations of life set the remote limitations of relief work. Our own limitations and those of the poor fix the unyielding limits beyond which our achievement can not reach. Ideals relate to ends rather than to means. They govern persons more effectually than relations but they govern even persons imperfectly. If, therefore, we aim to establish ideal relations among the poor or to build up ideal characters among

them or to reconstruct ideal homes and establish ideal environment for them we shall undoubtedly serve them badly and demonstrate our unfitness to serve at all. Strange as it may seem, we are often cruel in asking of the poor results which even the most cultured fail to reach. When we offer to the poor an impossible idealism and judge them by it, we are guilty of injustice toward them. If we expect all of the children of the poor whom we befriend, to become good citizens and successful members of society, we ask more of them than even our churches expect from their most fortunate members. We sometimes judge the efficiency of an orphan asylum adversely by demanding that all orphans turn out well. At the same time, we overlook the average of failure among the well-to-do and the rich in rearing their children. We are more tolerant of a club man who drinks to excess than we are of a loafing dependent who is a drunkard. We excoriate the poor girl who is ignorant and lazy and we pay court to the rich girl who is ignorant and dull.

John Stuart Mill began life with the determination to reform the world. He modified his philosophy when he discovered that the limitations against which he fought were the everlasting limitations of life itself, to overcome which all of the wisdom of man is unequal. We must submit to the limitations of human nature even when we proclaim the ideals which inspire it. The intelligence and efficiency of social workers, therefore, will be governed by the definite and homely aims which they establish for themselves. We are helpful to the poor only when we understand them. When we offer ourselves as channels through which the blessed traditions of civilization may come to them, we must look toward them in the light of our ideals, but we must not idealize them. Work for the poor has often been cursed by a sentimentalism and an ill-regulated idealism which have too often provoked laughter and invited scorn. Amiable intentions and good impulses are among the abundant progeny of ideals. But they are often very bad children. It is difficult to hold the middle way between the optimism of the idealist and the despair of the pessimist. The



social worker above all others in the world must do so else he will fail. His virtues and his efficiency will depend always on his intelligent understanding of the limitations of life as these affect his work among the poor.

We are limited again by lack of capacity on the part of dependents to understand our teaching and to respond to our efforts. What is held in mind here is not the series of limitations of life itself so much as the particular limitations of the poor themselves. As a class they have an outlook and an experience which reduce materially their capacity to understand us or understanding, to obey us. The atmosphere in which they are compelled to live dulls apprehension and veils imagination. At times they listen unheeding and they remain unstirred by the spell of our eloquence. We tell a weary and distracted mother who is careless and untidy and dull, what she ought to do to refine her housekeeping, but our words fall upon deaf ears and our wisdom draws no ray of understanding from her unlit eye. A good natured drunkard will listen to our sermons and our scoldings and will endorse all that we say with a contrite assurance of lasting reform, but his appetite for drink refuses to abdicate its supremacy in his life. A story is told about a highly idealistic charity worker who singled out a very bad boy upon whose conversation she was willing to stake her wisdom. On one occasion while she was delivering an eloquent lecture to him on the ideals of citizenship and the aspirations of manly souls, she noticed that his eyes were lighted with animated interest and he seemed to follow her every word with approving mind. The evidence of her conquest over this unruly soul stimulated her to greater eloquence until the climax came when the boy remarked with great simplicity, "You ought to see how fast your jaw goes." The boy had no capacity to understand or to receive the message as it was given. His soul had remained untouched. What could be done depended upon him and not upon the friendly soul which sought to serve him, but she had not understood.

Scholars tell us of a law of adjustment by which fishes lose their sight when they inhabit unlighted waters. Organs perish

when they are not used. When society herds the poor in environment which kills ambition and blunts moral sense; which robs life of outlook, of motive and of opportunity, shall we wonder at their lack of capacity to respond to our appeals and to coöperate with our efforts? The senses to which we appeal are those which have lost their power. The social workers who go among the poor and fail to understand the particular limitations which poverty causes in its victims, are poorly equipped for their work.

Another limitation to which we are subjected is found in lack of will on the part of the poor to coöperate with us. They might do so but they refuse. They understand what we say. They recognize the duties which we declare and the opportunities which we provide, and yet they refuse to be lifted. At this point, we may reasonably blame them. After making due allowance for all of those circumstances which diminish moral responsibility as our theologians understand it, we come face to face with those features of poverty for which the poor are personally, individually and directly responsible. They will, of course, at all times indulge in their own stupidities just as we indulge in ours. They will yield to their own perversities just as their more fortunate brothers yield to their own. The conduct of the poor in instances like these is related in some measure to the total absence of fear from their atmosphere. The ordinary sanctions of life which moralize us and strengthen us against our temptations are weakened if not eliminated from the feeling and thinking of many among the poor. After everything has happened to them, there is nothing left for them to fear. The poor are at the bottom. They cannot fall. The type now referred to has few aspirations for better things. It suffers but little when those few are defeated. Among them life is stripped of its illusions, its metaphors, its cheering symbols and its stimulating contacts. Hence, the wisdom and the help that we offer to them fail so often to awaken response and their wills remain untouched.

The poor have their own philosophy, without a doubt. Many actions and attitudes among them which we call crimes and trea-

son in the upper world, lack the color of guilt here and become at worst pardonable failings if not seeming virtues. The elementary determinations of humanity are largely fixed. We are helped on toward virtue by joy and refinement, by hope and security, by outlook and assistance from those about us. In proportion as these elements depart from the atmosphere of poverty, the will of the poor is weakened. They are subjected to tests in moral heroism and spiritual determination to which most of us might in the same circumstances prove unequal. There is a touch of fatalism among the poor which is the natural outcome of their experience. Lack of capacity and lack of will as we meet them, therefore, fix the limitations against which we must combat when we enter their world. These are to a great extent problems that are larger than the individual. They are penalties visited immediately upon the poor and remotely upon us for the shameful neglect of society of which they are the immediate victims. The supreme practical law of social service is that we must help the poor. It is not enough that we should declare ourselves and indulge in the luxury of doing good regardless of those in whose interests we work.

Another limitation is placed upon us because of the fact that large numbers of the poor suffer irreparable harm before we reach them. When we break an arm, a physician repairs the damage. When we break a door or a window or a chair, it is easily replaced. When even the human heart is broken, as the phrase is, by tragedy or sorrow, nature will sometimes restore its hope and peace in her own mysterious way. But after poverty has disintegrated a home, who shall restore it? After wretched housing conditions have destroyed the seclusion and privacy by which our virtues are conditioned, who shall restore these virtues to their destined vigor? After an innocent little girl has been hurled in spite of herself into the ways of degradation and shameful knowledge, what human wisdom may even hope to restore her innocence? When adversity and neglect have rendered fathers and mothers incapable of understanding or of performing the duties of parenthood, who shall make them over into wise and helpful guides for their children? "Can a man be born again?" When unnatural physical and social

surroundings have prevented a boy from acquiring the fundamental sense of respect for property and he has become a thief, who shall restore the moral integrity and the memory of blamelessness on which character depends? Do we not too often forget this, the most devastating and distressing single feature of the lot of the poor? If poverty were merely a question of income we could rob it of every one of its terrors, but the implications of irreparable harm associated with it give our work a fundamentally different character. When we work among the poor who have been thus harmed, we deal with a class which has not had normal moral and social experience; a class which has not normal moral and spiritual resources; a class whose restoration demands almost an exalted heroism and makes that heroism most difficult of attainment.

Relief agencies find it extremely difficult to discover their fundamental agreements and to co-operate faithfully and loyally in their work. This condition fixes another limitation upon us. Inherited differences of religion, differences of party and of spirit, differences of temperament, unconscious personal ambition of leaders, experience of disloyalty and indirection disintegrate the solidarity of our relief forces and greatly reduce their power. Methods contend against methods among us, standards against standards. Judgments disagree as to conditions, causes and processes of dependency. In spite of a very general desire to find our fundamental agreements and to be governed by them, we are conscious that that happy issue is not promised to us in the near future, although hopeful advances toward co-operation and trust have been made. Hawthorne complained in his day of the difficulty of inducing the representatives of righteousness to work together in the ways of peaceful agreement. That day is still with us. These differences occur within the lines of religion and schools of thought as well as among them. It is probable that we shall never reach entire harmony. Whatever the prospects as regards the future, there is no doubt that our work is greatly hampered by the differences which separate the great army of well-disposed and earnest social workers into unrelated phalanxes. Poverty is a fundamental problem. It is, therefore, complex and elusive. The

treatment of its simplest phases touches fundamental questions of philosophy and of morals, hence the divisions which these cause in life at large appear at every turn among our workers. All things considered, we should rejoice that we have been able to accomplish as much as we have accomplished in the direction of harmony and co-operation.

The restoration of a single typical dependent family to independence and hope, depends on the happy co-ordination of a large number of factors. Our inability to assemble and relate these, places another fundamental limitation upon us. If this is true of the single family, it is for a still greater reason true of all poor families taken collectively. Satisfactory laws and satisfactory administration, police and truant officers, employers and friendly visitors, landlords and trades people enter directly in one way or in another as conditions or as factors in the lot of the poor. It is only when we can co-ordinate all of these that we can do our most helpful work for the poor. We are always failing at this point, and therefore, the results of our efforts fall so often short of our intelligence and our resources. Many of the elements in the environment of the poor, such as housing, association, saloons, street playgrounds, bad example, contact with sin and uncertain employment will remain in spite of us. In other words, we are compelled to lift the poor while they remain in an environment which bears them down.

One provoking feature of this condition is found in the persistent indifference of law-making bodies to their duties toward the poor. Volunteer associations are compelled to expend a large proportion of their means and their energy in begging and pleading and beseeching law-makers to do their elementary duty in the interests of the elementary decencies of life. Years of struggle are required, incredible amounts of money are necessary to educate our leaders to the point where they will take care of the most persistent and shameless causes of misery, disaster and crime among the poor. It seems incredible that it should be necessary to fight for years in order to convince a legislature or a city council that housing conditions are shameful, that conditions of labor and employment outrage the first prin-

ciples of human justice and morality, that much of the disease and helplessness of the poor are due to social conditions for which society at large must be in common justice, blamed. The ignorance of our leaders must be overcome; the selfishness of those who make their profits out of the helpless poor must be scourged; the persuasive learning of able attorneys who argue for the sanctity of worn-out phrases, and shut their eyes to the sanctities of life, must be overcome before we can have conditions in which poverty may be robbed of its terrors, and hope may find admission into its circles.

#### IV.

Large views lead one toward philosophy and interpretations. Detailed views lead one toward action and practical judgment. Both types have their appointed places in life. Each is disposed toward its own particular kinds of mistake. When estrangement occurs between them, both suffer because each is the best corrective which the other finds. Work for the poor has suffered greatly because of the disregard felt mutually between those who look upon poverty from a general social standpoint on the one hand, and those who look upon it from the standpoint of particular cases and simple detail. The former type is overwhelmingly in the ascendency today. The scholarship and the collective sympathies of our time favor strongly the approach to poverty through large views based on broad studies. This method has already sharpened our vision and improved our methods in relief work. There is, of course, some danger of over-emphasis in it. We meet occasionally those who become very unfeeling and harsh in dealing with the poor because their human sympathies wither in presence of the intellectual joy that the mind gets from generalizing and from being freed of the effort to handle rebellious details. We ought to hold to the general social point of view faithfully. We should at the same time, take care lest sense for detail be lost, lest wisdom in dealing with one poor family be denied to us because of our habit of generalizing and of thinking of all poor families as one mass.

Conscious and systematic effort to interpret each case of poverty in its relation to all poverty; equally careful effort to understand all poverty through the vision which we derive from sensible dealing with each particular case which we meet, should give us the happy combination of forces through which all hope of relief work must come. General views taken from the field of poverty are here offered to the practical worker to serve him as best they may.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

## SCOTT'S CATHOLIC TENDENCIES.

---

As Cardinal Newman points out, in his "Present Position of Catholics in England," the English people as a whole, have been, since the days of the "Reformation," the most unreasonable, if not the most aggressive, foes of the Catholic cause. It is only in the last half century that their eyes have been partially opened. And it was, unfortunately, in the Protestant Elizabethan age and the Protestant "Golden Age" of Queen Anne that modern classic English literature was formed. It was as much as an author's literary life was worth to set forth anything openly favoring Catholicity; and those who so far forgot themselves, whether through honesty or natural enthusiasm, were invariably forced to explain or apologise for their backsliding—to offset their word of commendation by a due meed of censure—if they cared to be re-habilitated in the popular esteem.

Says Newman: "There is Alexander Pope, a Catholic, and who would discover it from the run of his poems? There is Samuel Johnson, born a Protestant, yearning for the Catholic Church, and bursting into fitful defences of portions of her doctrine and discipline, yet professing to the very last that Protestantism which could neither command his affections nor cure his infirmities. And, in our own times, there was Walter Scott, ashamed of his own Catholic tendencies and cowering before the jealous frown of the tyrant Tradition. There was Wordsworth obliged to do penance for Catholic sonnets by anti-Catholic complements to them.

"Scott must plead, forsooth, antiquarianism in extenuation of his prevarication; Wordsworth must plead Pantheism; and Burke again must plead political necessity. Liberalism, skepticism, infidelity, these must be the venial errors under plea of which a writer escapes reprobation for the enormity of feeling tenderly towards the religion of his fathers and of his neighbors



around him. That religion labors under a proscription of three centuries, and it is outlawed by immemorial custom."

When we bear in mind, then, that "Protestantism is the religion of our literature, that it has become the Tradition of civil intercourse and political life . . . that its assumptions are among the elements of knowledge, unchangeable as the moods of logic, or the idioms of language, or the injunctions of good taste, or the proprieties of good manners," it is all the more remarkable to find men like those whom Newman mentions, and others of the best minds of every post-Reformation epoch, paying an involuntary, an unconscious, nay, an enforced tribute, to the superiority of Catholic personages, institutions and ideas. From Shakespeare who is so Catholic in tone and feeling as to be numbered by not a few unbiassed commentators among the adherents of the Church—Catholic at heart if not in profession—down to Mrs. Humphry Ward and Gilbert Chesterton, one is struck by the almost uniform respect and reverence manifested by the first-rate authors towards persons and things Catholic. Even Dickens, who showed so much narrowness and prejudice in his "Pictures from Italy" condescends, on rare occasions, to contribute his mite of admiration in some of his less widely known publications.

Needless to remark, this "praise from Sir Hubert," this tribute of esteem from men outside the pale of the Church, from men of brains who had nothing to gain and everything to lose by giving vent to such opinions; from men who gave their testimony in the teeth of popular passion and prejudice, or—what amounts to the same thing and even more—unwittingly, and almost in spite of themselves, is assuredly something not to be overlooked in modern apologetics.

To confine ourselves for the present to one of these eminent external witnesses for the worth of Catholic principles and ideas and institutions; for the effect of Catholic influences on the making of character, take Sir Walter Scott to whom Newman refers (in the passage above quoted) as one "ashamed of his own Catholic tendencies and cowering before the jealous frown of the tyrant Tradition . . . pleading antiquarianism in extenuation of his prevarication."

That Newman's charges are well founded there cannot be the slightest doubt in the minds of those who are acquainted with the works of the great novelist. And yet and notwithstanding, there is no straining after effect, no garbling of truth, nothing far-fetched, in styling this same Walter Scott one of the heralds or fore-runners of that famous Tractarian movement whose chief apostle was Newman himself. Yes; we may assert safely, deliberately and advisedly, without any exaggeration, that Sir Walter was very largely instrumental in bringing about the present more sensible and more tolerant attitude of Englishmen towards the Church Catholic.

Not that Scott ever had, of course, any such notion or intention, or ever proposed to himself any such result. There are no sufficient grounds for suspecting that he had any serious doubts anent the security of his position, any scruples against retaining his Protestant creed, much less a positive belief in distinctively Catholic doctrines. That is not at all our meaning. He was certainly not an apostle of the great Romeward trend in the same sense that Newman was. But for all that, it is none the less true that, however unwittingly, he helped along the good cause, and perhaps just as effectively in his own sphere as Pusey and Keble did in theirs, by calling the attention of his numerous readers to many of the most attractive features of old Catholic times and manners and personages, by throwing a little light on the hitherto dark corners, disabusing the British mind of some of its gross, unfounded prejudices, by opening to conviction, partially at least, some of the best types of that same British mind, and so paving the way for the later work of the Tractarians.

"To him," (Scott) says Andrew Lang, "is due the beginning of a better appreciation of all popular antiquities, and a *more human understanding of history*." And this was precisely what the British mind, of all minds, needed most. As Cardinal Newman demonstrated in his lectures on "The Present Position of Catholics in England," it was the sheer, the appalling and abysmal *ignorance* of the English people that lay at the root of their almost unparalleled bigotry. So intense and deep-rooted

was that bigotry that they could not be brought even to listen to reason. They would have none of it. There were no two sides to the question at all. There was but one side—and that side was theirs. The only way to reach such people—to make at least a beginning of an impression—was the way of indirection; of inoculating them unawares, if not with love, at least with a certain inevitable admiration, for Catholic times and peoples and customs. I say “inoculating them unawares”: for they were like children who can be induced to take a bitter, unpalatable dose only by concealing it under the presence of sweets. Had the rank and file of Scott's readers perceived whither they were gradually drifting, or likely to drift, had they once awakened to the consciousness of such an influence working upon them, they would as surely have fled from it as they would from the arch-fiend himself.

And yet it was this very influence that was actually exerted by most of Sir Walter's novels. Whenever there is question of setting off Catholic against Protestant, or Protestant against Catholic, when the author has occasion to contrast the old Catholic with the new Protestant epochs and personages, the Catholic seldom suffers by the contrast. And that is really putting the thing rather mildly. I don't mean to say that there are no exceptions; but as a rule, the reflecting and impartial reader cannot fail to observe that the author's admiration goes out to the old régime.

It may be objected that religion had nothing to do with this seeming preference, that it was wholly due—as Scott himself maintained—to his love and worship of the antique. The contention is freely granted for the sake of argument. I am not inquiring into the author's motives. I am not giving him any credit for being a willing, or even a conscious, missionary for the Catholic cause. On the contrary, it has been stated most explicitly in the foregoing paragraphs that what he did, he did unwittingly. But the fact remains nevertheless that, *nolens volens*, he really did a good work for us; that he was, in a sense, one of the pioneers of the improved and decidedly more reasonable present-day sentiment of English Protestants to

wards the Church of Rome. And that is the only point I am trying to make.

Scott was by nature too big-hearted, too generous and tolerant and broad-minded to allow any prepossessions of his to blind his eyes to the indubitable truth; and had he lived in a more tolerant age or country, had he been free in every respect, financial, popular and otherwise, to follow his bent, without let or hindrance, no doubt he would never have deviated a hair's breadth from the path of justice and square-dealing. But it was a bigoted age, and a bigoted people for whom he wrote, and he was not always strong enough to withstand the pressure of the times and circumstances. And so, through fear of popular contempt or disfavor, and against the promptings of his better self no doubt, he weakly made concessions to popular passion and prejudice, even permitting it occasionally to carry him to palpable extremes.

Withal, it is easy enough to see on which side his sympathies lay. His Catholic characters are, as a rule, high-grade, high-minded, dignified, noble and brave, and will almost uniformly bear comparison with the best of their non-Catholic fellows. But no doubt it will be far more convincing, as well as far more agreeable, to let our author speak for himself and to let him present his own pictures of Catholic times and people. To put the left foot foremost, or to give the dark side of the picture first: In *The Monastery* he talks, like a genuine, true blue Protestant, of "the usurpations of Rome," and the "erroneous, though fervent and sincere" prayers of Father Eustace, and has the usual Protestant notion of Rome's "hostility" to the Bible. There are, too, occasional little slurs anent the monks whom he characterizes as "nasal-twanged, petticoated old women." However, in justice to Scott, it should be noticed that these slurs come from the lips of Halbert Glendinning who, while physically brave enough, is by no means a very likeable personage. As Scott paints him, he was almost eaten up with self-conceit and ambition; morose and time-serving. He never did have much regard or respect for real religion of any kind, and eventually apostatized to better, not his soul, but his worldly

fortunes. Nor is the character of the Abbot Boniface drawn very plausibly. It is hardly probable that such a self-indulgent ninny would have been raised to his lofty and responsible position. The author also gives vent at times to ribald remarks about Catholic doctrines and practices—"the narrow and bigoted ignorance in which Rome then educated the children of her Church"—(*The Monastery*, Chap. xxx). He re-hashes the old stale lies anent the "buying of pardon for sin," etc. But here again, these remarks are put into the mouth of Julian Avenel the freebooter, a man of no religious principle or conviction, who cared equally little for Protestant and Catholic, and had no more regard for morals than he had for Faith.

It would be scarcely possible to find a more serious, and at the same time a more unreasonable or groundless, indictment of Catholicity than the following: "Their whole religion was a ritual, and their prayers the formal iteration of unknown words which . . . could yield but little consolation. . . . Unused to the practice of mental devotion and of personal approach to the Divine Presence by prayer" (*Ibidem*). A convincing proof of Newman's charge that Scott sometimes resorted to ultra-Protestant methods to make amends for his Catholic leanings and set himself right with his unreasoning readers.

*The Monastery* is probably the worst of his novels as far as Catholics are concerned: It looks as though the author, like the stone rolling down a steep declivity, having once gotten a fair start, was utterly unable to stop himself. On and down he must go, and so on and down he went. "Errors and human inventions with which the Church of Rome had defaced the simple edifice of Christianity," he wrote; "that ancient system which so well accommodated its doctrines to the wants and wishes of a barbarous age, had, since the art of printing and the gradual diffusion of knowledge, lain floating like some huge leviathan" (*Idem*, chap. xxxi).

In *The Abbot* (the sequel to *The Monastery*) he continues the throwing of sops to his bigoted audience: "the charge of idolatry to which the superstitious devotion of the Papists had justly exposed them . . . nor could we have considered the preser-

vation of these monuments of antiquity as an object to be put in the balance with the introduction of the Reformed worship." (Chap. 13.) Of the last Abbot of Kennaquhair (Ambrose) he writes, with a blending of justice and injustice, of fairness and bigotry: "Bold and enthusiastic, yet generous and forgiving; wise and skilful, yet zealous and prompt, he wanted but a better cause than the support of a decaying superstition to have raised him to the rank of a truly great man . . . whose success would have riveted on Scotland the chains of antiquated superstition and spiritual tyranny."

In *Ivanhoe* these concessions to ultra-Protestant prejudice crop out so noticeably at times that, did we not see the author's name on the title-page, we might think we were listening to the most arrant bigot in Christendom. Consider particularly his reflections on the death of Front-de-Bœuf: "He had not the usual recourse of bigots in that superstitious period most of whom were wont to atone for the crimes they were guilty of by liberality to the Church, stupefying by this means their terrors by the idea of atonement and forgiveness; and although the refuge which success thus purchased was no more like to the peace of mind which follows on sincere repentance than the turbid stupefaction procured by opium resembles healthy and natural slumbers, it was still a state of mind preferable to the agonies of awakened remorse . . . he preferred setting Church and churchmen at defiance to purchasing from them pardon and absolution at the price of treasures and of manors. . . . The baron would have alleged that the Church sold her wares too dear, that the spiritual freedom which she put up to sale was only to be bought, like that of the chief captain of Jerusalem, 'with a great sum.'"

"What care I for the piece of gold," said Rebecca's messenger (chap. 38), "if I am to come to harm from the priest next Easter at confession, and be obliged to give him twice as much to make it up with him?"

Sir Walter's account of Athelstane's treatment by the Abbot and monks of St. Edmund's (chap. 42)—practically burying him alive to get his lands—is, to say the least, altogether unpardonable. It almost takes one's breath away. It simply beg-

gars description, and is so unnecessary and ridiculous that we must in charity conclude that Scott was beside himself—delirious, raving—when he penned it. Even his ultra-Protestant readers, and his own friends, criticised him severely for this abominable bit of lurid fantasy,—and the only apology he could offer them for his insolent, madcap breach of the probabilities was that “it was a *tour de force* to which he was compelled to have recourse by the vehement entreaties of his friend and printer who was inconsolable on the Saxon being conveyed to the tomb.”

*The Fortunes of Nigel* too contains its due share of the trite old calumnies against monks and nuns. “In Spain,” he writes, “you might have heard how the Catholic priests, and particularly the monks, besiege the beds of the dying to obtain bequests for the good of the Church.” His description of the abbess and nuns of the convent in the mountains of the Guadarrama, and their inhuman treatment of Hermione, is simply vile. The lowest of our low-down bigoted adversaries could scarcely have done much worse. The nuns, he tells us, “were proud and ignorant. . . the superior was said to have disgraced her connections by her conduct during youth; and now, in advanced age, covetousness and love of power, a spirit too of severity and cruelty, had succeeded to the thirst after licentious pleasure.” (Chap. xx.)

The portrait of the Prior in *The Fair Maid of Perth* is a rather mongrel sketch in which the painter seems to fear the impression the good side is likely to make on his audience and quickly draws a less beautiful side to offset it. The Prior’s vices, he tells us, were those of his age and profession, his virtues all his own: implying thereby that what virtues he had, he had, not because of, but rather in spite of, his religious profession. And one of the author’s favorite characters in this same novel is Father Clement the heretic, into whose mouth he puts most noble sentiments anent the early Church and the “Reform”; though, whether intentionally or otherwise, he shows clearly enough in the course of his narrative that the good Father was something of a time-server or expedience-man—one

who believed that "the end justifies the means"—ready, for the good of "the cause" to sacrifice the *Fair Maid of Perth* to the tender mercies of the voluptuary, Prince David—a sacrifice which the fair maid, with much spirit, and greatly to her praise, firmly refused to make, notwithstanding her admiration for the worthy apostle of the "Reform."

\* \* \*

I must admit that there is not much in the foregoing to prove my thesis. Quite the contrary. It certainly looks as though I were trying to prove the reverse. And the impatient, long-suffering reader might inquire with reason: Whither are you drifting, or what is the purport of all this? Now that we have before us the dark side of the picture, one who is not thoroughly acquainted with Scott's works may well wonder how it is possible to draw a side bright and beautiful enough to counter-balance all this ugliness. In all candor it seems a truly Herculean task. From what has been said, one thing at least is very evident; one statement at least has been fully proved, to wit: that Sir Walter was not a missionary in the sense that Newman was. That surely needs no further proof; it is established beyond the shadow of a doubt. And it might further be said that these clear proofs of the author's bias and prejudice and ignorant bigotry—proofs drawn, moreover, out of his own mouth—render utterly null and void our claim that he was, in any sense whatsoever, a contributor to the rise and spread of the famous Tractarian movement.

By way of reply: the aim of the paper is to give the truth and nothing but the truth. I have no desire or intention of trying to get out of Scott's admissions more than there is in them. Newman asserted that Sir Walter had Catholic tendencies, and Newman knew whereof he spoke. He asserted too that our author sometimes throttled his own inclinations, stifled his own sentiments and toadied to popular passion and prejudice to retain the popular favor. This also is perfectly true. And it is but fair to give both sides of the author—the good, and the bad, the wheat and the chaff—in his own words, and let the reader judge for himself.



We have seen with disgust the repulsive side, and now for a look at the other, for there is another. If Sir Walter Scott has said many harsh, unfair and untrue things of us, he has also given utterance to many sentiments that are not only true and fair, but, in the circumstances, generous. What he said of the Prior in *The Fair Maid of Perth* may be said with much more truth of himself: "His vices were those of his age and profession; his virtues were all his own."

To begin with: that is not at all such a bad picture of the Benedictine in his Introduction to *The Monastery*. Scott candidly admits that the monk was a gentleman and a scholar; a really good man, moreover, full of zeal, forgiving, wise, sensible and considerate, etc. (Capt. Clutterbuck's Letter.) Which, assuredly, means not a little in an age when, as the author himself says, through the lips of the Benedictine, so few outside the pale of the Church allowed to Catholics,—especially to the monks—"any merit, whether literary or spiritual." Sir Walter's monk is not, in this instance at least, a rebel or an intriguer, but on the contrary, a man thoroughly broad-minded, free from bigotry, and devotedly loyal to the king and the established order of things.

In the body of the work (*The Monastery*) he tells us that the vassals of the monastic institutions were immensely better off, in point of wealth and information, than the vassals of the lay lords. In fact the account he gives of their condition is most favorable throughout. They are fairly prosperous, contented, well-protected, generally immune from the horrors of war, and their government is a kindly paternalism standing out in vivid contrast to the too-prevalent despotism of the big and petty temporal rulers. While the Abbot Boniface is hardly our ideal of the religious superior, his portrait is, after all has been duly weighed, not so unfair. He is not by any means an improbable personage. Perhaps the character is slightly overdrawn. The thoughtful reader may consider it unlikely that a man of such little brain force, and of such rather low tastes, should have been chosen for such a responsible position. But the author does not give this as a rule or a type; he offsets the picture by portraits of truly ideal religious—such as Abbots

Eustace and Edward. And even Boniface himself draws us to him with all his little shortcomings. At least he is human; he is kindly, big-hearted and, in one instance, heroic and sublime. All this will appear from the sequel.

If he makes a sarcastic reference to Father Eustace's "erroneous prayers" he also gives the prior credit for real heroism, for a most remarkable degree of self-control, self-sacrifice. The picture of Eustace is that of a real manly man and a genuine religious. In the main a *Catholic* Scott could scarcely have done better. In the encounter of wits between Father Eustace and the preacher Warden, the monk has the manifest advantage throughout—in courtesy, generosity, fairness and broadness of view. What Scott's intent was, he himself tells us, (in the Introduction to *The Monastery*), namely, to give his readers the views of two enthusiasts "with the same sincerity and purity of intention." At all events, the candid reader must admit that in this intellectual rencontre, he has endeavored to carry out his program—he has been, to the best of his ability, fair and square. No higher tribute could be paid Father Eustace than the one paid him by Warden himself—his adversary: "You cannot inflict more than he will endure. He is a man whose misfortunes would more prejudice our cause than his prosperity . . . the more he is made to bear, the higher will be the influence of his talents and his courage . . . his patience, eloquence and learning will win more hearts from the good cause than all the mitred abbots of Scotland have been able to make prey of during the last hundred years." (Chap. 37.) Perhaps Sir Walter "buildd better than he knew."

In *The Abbot*, despite its many censurable statements and descriptions, the author frequently pays tribute to the Church and its ministers. Thus the churlishness and spitefulness, the bad taste and fanaticism of Henry Warden the reformed preacher stand out in rather striking contrast to the nobleness, the good breeding and magnanimity of Father Eustace; and though Sir Walter looks upon Magdalen Graeme as a fanatic, he puts genuine Catholic prayers and speeches into her mouth. The intelligent reader will be able to read between the lines. Remember too the characterization of Eustace given in the first

part of this article: "Bold and enthusiastic, generous and forgiving, wise and skilful, zealous and prompt . . . whose talents commanded respect and whose virtues, even from the enemies of his faith, extorted esteem." (Chap. 13.) Here is something that is truly worth while—something that speaks volumes: "Did we not," said the abbot to the mummers—the turncoat, rankly ungrateful beneficiaries of the monks—"did we not wake while you slept?" "Some of the good wives of the hali-dome were wont to say so," replied the abbot of unreason; but his jest met in this instance but slight applause." Just before the battle which took place near Glasgow, after Mary's escape from the castle of Lochleven, Scott, by the lips of Catherine Seyton, says of the Abbot Eustace: "the monk is the only soldier and man of sense amongst you all."

While Scott's admiration for Mary Stuart, and his detestation for Titus Oates and his ilk, have no direct connection with religion, his treatment of the events in which these two played the leading parts is highly relevant to our purpose. We are fully aware that Sir Walter thought and wrote as he did anent both from a sheer sense of truth and justice and without any regard to the religion or irreligion of his subjects. But the fact—the important fact—remains, that he *did* tell the truth; that he *did* do his subjects justice; and the fact that he told the truth and took the right side *only* from a sense of justice, and not from any religious motive, makes his testimony all the more valuable and trustworthy. Coming from a Catholic, the opinions of Sir Walter would have had a partisan sound, but coming as they did from him they bear about them the hall marks of truth. It is "praise from Sir Hubert." Abstracting from his motive, we, as Catholics, must feel eternally grateful to Scott for his noble and whole-hearted defence of Mary Stuart and his scathing denunciation of the demon Oates in such a bigoted age as the one for which he wrote.

His Catholic characters in *Ivanhoe* are not, as a rule, very creditable to us—especially the priests and monks. He might easily, and without any real prejudice to his story, have given us a few more of the better type. However, to be fair and square, we must admit that the history of the times *does* supply

prototypes, or something very like prototypes—of the fictitious personages whom he paints. Besides, he makes ample amends for this somewhat unkindly portraiture in many other instances. To do him justice, his “Romanist” *dramatis personae* are generally calculated to arouse the intelligent reader’s admiration. While Scott looks upon them as benighted in the matter of religious belief, he pictures them almost uniformly as devotedly brave and loyal, noble, high-minded, dignified and self-sacrificing. They may not win the affection of his bigoted audience, but they are bound to win its esteem for themselves and, in some degree at least, for the system that produced them.

His description of Sir Frederick Vernon and his daughter Diana Vernon in *Rob Roy* are beautiful pen-pictures of noble, high-minded Catholics whose whole lives are governed solely by a sense of duty, and who are ready to sacrifice all for their religion and for him whom they recognize as their king. Again, in *The Fair Maid of Perth*, the author paints the Prior Anselm as a wise, an honest and an honorable man, a man thoroughly bold and fearless, without respect to persons, unafraid to tell the truth—and, at times, the most bitter and unpalatable truth—to Prince David to the Grim Douglas, and even to King Robert himself.

Generally throughout *The Monastery* and *The Abbot*, Boniface is the comic opera abbot, the type of monk on whom the enemies of the monks love to dwell, the kind we see featured on the walls of the rathskellers; the fat, lazy, self-indulgent monk, with little brains or courage, loving the pleasures of the table, etc. Yet, as I remarked above, even Boniface is free from any immorality and, (seemingly as a compensation—and a truly generous one—a concession which, like charity, covers a multitude of sins) on the occasion of his resignation, Sir Walter portrays him as a man of real sense, judgment and magnanimity, even to the verge of heroism, and at bottom a man willing to sacrifice all that he has and is to the interests of the cause which is so dear to his heart. “Brethren,” he said, rising up and coming forward with that dignity which his comely person enabled him to assume, “my resolution is taken. Hear for the

last time the voice of your abbot Boniface. . . . It becomes me not to hold a place whereof the duties, through my default or misfortune, may be but imperfectly filled by me," etc. And when the leading monks began to protest "the abbot listened in downcast silence; even flattery could not win his ear." If any man there present *could* win his ear, it was the sub-prior Eustace, the staff on which Boniface had felt himself forced to lean for so long—Eustace the keen-sighted and truth-speaking—but even *he* failed to weaken the old man's determination. "My lord abbot," said Eustace, "if I have been silent concerning the virtues with which you have governed this house, do not think that I am unaware of them. I know that no man ever brought to your office a more sincere wish to do well to all mankind; and if your rule has not been marked with the bold lines which sometimes distinguished your predecessors, their faults have equally been strangers to your character." . . . "No, Father Eustace," replied the abbot, "you shall not conquer me by your generosity. In times like these, this house must have a stronger pilotage than my weak hands afford; and he who steers the vessel must be chief of the crew. Shame were it to accept the praise of other men's labors; and in my poor mind all the praise which can be bestowed on him who undertakes a task so perilous is a meed beneath his merits. . . . Assume, therefore, your authority tonight, and proceed in the preparations you judge necessary. . . . Benedicite, my brethren,—peace be with you. May the new abbot-expectant sleep as sound as he who is about to resign his mitre." And Sir Walter adds: "They retired, affected even to tears. The good abbot had shown a point of his character to which they were strangers. Even Father Eustace had held his superior hitherto as a good-humored, indolent, self-indulgent man, whose chief merit was the absence of gross faults; so that this sacrifice of power to a sense of duty, even if a little alloyed by the meaner motives of fear and apprehended difficulties, raised him considerably in the sub-prior's estimation."

To give another instance—and that by no means one of the best—take the fierce, intractable *Redgauntlet* (or Herries of Birrenswork). He is not a very lovable man. On the con-

trary, he is hard, abrupt, taciturn and on occasions violent. And yet withal, there is something so radically noble and high-minded about him that the impartial, discriminating reader can't help respecting and admiring him, and can't help feeling that he may well be weighed in the balance with his foil, Joshua Geddes the Quaker. Redgauntlet is what the times and circumstances have made him, and his deeds of violence are never done for his own interest. He is a man of ideals, of unswerving loyalty, unselfish, sacrificing all for the cause on which his heart is set. When Darsie Latimer complains of his high-handed methods, he answers: "The sentiment is natural; but do not on your side complain that I, who am carrying on an important undertaking, use the only means in my power for insuring its success." And again: "The line of conduct which I am pursuing towards you is dictated, not by choice, but by necessity . . . our mortal path is limited by the regulations of honor."

In fact Sir Walter's character-sketches of Redgauntlet and Geddes must give the discerning reader a pretty fair notion of what I mean by saying that the author's sympathies and admiration are generally on the side of his Catholic personages. True, he pictures Herries as a man full of glaring faults, proud and violent, and makes Darsie Latimer contrast the "open manner of the kind-hearted Joshua with the abrupt, dark and lofty demeanor" of Herries; but, as I remarked above, he offsets that very considerably by bringing out the ennobling effect of the Cause in which Herries is engaged and the sacrifices he made to further it. Besides, every judicious reader must feel that, if he had a deal to make, he would trust Herries—who, in spite of his blunt manners, was a born gentleman—in preference to Joshua the man of peace and non-resistance, with his little meannesses and pious cant and eye ever open to the main chance.<sup>1</sup> At least Herries was thoroughly honest, straightforward and above-board. Not so the oily, smooth-

<sup>1</sup> As Redgauntlet himself said of the Quaker: "This pious pattern of primitive simplicity. . . will shear thee like a sheep if you come to buying and selling with him."

mannered Quaker, who evidently had a little of the leaven of the Pharisee in his religious make-up. When, in his surprise and loss of self-control, he has termed Benjie "the mischievous bastard! the doomed gallows-bird!" he tries to make good by what looks very much like a hypocritical afterthought: "Friend youth," he says, for the benefit of Latimer, "thou didst speak of the lad's soul . . . I did but speak of his outward man." And anent the incident of the fishing-nets, when Joshua's selfish casuistry is employed to salve his conscience—to persuade himself that he is the law-abiding citizen and Herries the law-breaker, Alan Fairford writes Darsie that all the best lawyers would hold Herries right and Joshua wrong. And much more to the same effect.

\* \* \* \*

We might continue on the same lines, running through the remaining works of Sir Walter Scott, thereby adding more pros and cons to the collection, but it would be rather superfluous. The foregoing excerpts culled from a selection of his novels are fairly representative and give a pretty accurate idea of his attitude towards Catholic doctrines and persons. From the extracts here given, two truths stand out most prominently—to wit—that, as regards Catholic doctrines, Scott was a thorough-going Protestant, full of the old leaven of ignorant prejudice, lavishly retailing the old stereotyped, stock-in-trade balderdash of the typical post-"Reformation" bigot; and, secondly, that as far as Catholic personages are concerned, he was, as a rule, eminently just and fair.

Touching the first feature of his novels—the ugly one—his ignorant charges of superstition, priest-craft, pardon-selling, etc., it was next to impossible for them to do much—if any—harm; as the people for whom he wrote were already so deeply steeped in bigotry that their condition could scarcely, by any human possibility, be rendered worse. Any one who has read Newman's lectures on "The Present Position of Catholics in England" is aware that there is no exaggeration in this statement. In fact we cannot be very far from the truth in believing that, if the novelist had not seasoned his tales of Cath-

olic times and manners with a considerable spice or relish of anti-"Popery," he would not have succeeded in getting a hearing at all. Instead, he would probably have been suspected of being a Jesuit in disguise. Remember what Newman says, in the passage quoted at the beginning of this paper. Every English author who showed any tendency whatsoever to Catholic practices or modes of thought and action felt obliged to apologise for his back-sliding under penalty of social and literary ostracism. So it was, not only with Sir Walter, but with Dr. Johnson, Burke, Wordsworth and Pope likewise.

In his historical settings, however,—while there is a modicum of error mixed with the truth—his pictures of old Catholic customs and institutions, his character-sketches of Catholics, etc., he has, I think, done us a real service. His monks are not angels; they have their defects: they would not be human if they hadn't; and surely there is no blame attaching to him for painting them as human. But withal, and taking them all in all, they are rather a fine body of men. With the exception of the preposterously ridiculous case of the burial of Athelstane, we have little fault to find with his treatment of the brethren. The superiors are, almost invariably real men—men of the highest mental and moral calibre; his testimony to the social usefulness of the monastic institutions and the general prosperity and contentment of their vassals, is calculated to carry more weight than the words even of a Montalembert in his "Monks of the West," coming as they do from such a staunch adherent of the system which loves monks and "monkery" about as much as the devil loves holy water.

As to his Catholic *dramatis personae*, whether historical or fictitious, consider for a moment the prevailing notions of the time anent, not only "Papist" teachings and practices, but concerning "Papist" personages as well. It seems incredible, but it is nevertheless the simple, unadorned truth, that they were looked at very much askance, as bugaboos, or bogey-men and bogey-women, who were not to be trusted in love, war or business. Their first and last principle, it appears, was that "the end justifies the means"; they were anarchists with a vengeance—and worse. It is half laughable, half pathetic; and



we wonder naturally how people with even a grain of intelligence or discernment could be so grossly befooled. To add to the wonderment—but why, after all, should we wonder? We who are accustomed to see this very identical ogre prowling about our own homes; we who find the self-same benighted ignorance—stupidity—flourishing, even at this late day, in many parts of the great and glorious American Republic. The charitable—and, in fact, the only plausible—explanation of this queer phenomenon is that those who are obsessed by such absurd fantasies do not know Catholics. Until they have met the professors of this “alien” faith, in business or social intercourse, they seem to doubt that Catholics are really human.

And if such is the *status quo* in the super-enlightened twentieth century, and in a country like ours in which all the nations and all the creeds of the wide world mix, what great reason can there be for wonder if we find the conditions almost infinitely worse in little, narrow insular England in the days of Sir Walter Scott? Newman knew; and here is what Newman had to say on the subject: “This, then is the last of the causes which I shall assign, and on which I shall insist, by way of accounting for the hatred and contempt shown towards the Catholics of England by their fellow-countrymen—*viz.*, that the Catholics of England, as a body, are not personally known. . . . When a man would really get information on a subject. he takes himself to head-quarters. The best letters and travels about a foreign people are tame and dead compared with the view he gains by residence among them.” I think that Scott’s Catholic characterizations helped very materially towards doing away with the unreasonable and comical fear, distrust and prejudice entertained by the British Protestant public generally regarding their Catholic fellow-citizens. And this, surely, was no small gain for the cause of truth. Once the English Protestant was brought to view the enemy at close range, to see him as he really is in everyday life, with the living flesh on his bones, perfectly human—even the priest; aye, and even the monk—without horns, tail or hoofs, the victory was already half won.

Newman goes on: “You have ceased to condemn, you have

learned to respect. And so again I would say of any book which lets you into the private life of personages who have any great deal to do with the government of the Church; which brings you, so to say, behind the scenes . . . where men appear what they are: it is simply impossible, or at least it would be as good as a miracle, for anyone to study such works and still consider that the Pope was the man of sin, and the Mother of saints a Jezabel. You see that Popes and Cardinals and Prelates are not griffins and wiverns, but men; good men or bad men, or neither one nor the other, as the case may be; bold men, or weak men, worldly men or unworldly, but still men. They have human feelings, human affections, human virtues, human anxieties, human hopes and joys, whatever higher than mere human excellence a Catholic, of course, would ascribe to them. They are no longer, as before, the wild beasts, or the frogs, or the locusts, or the plagues of the Apocalypse; such a notion, if you have ever entertained it, is gone for ever. You feel it to have been a ridiculous illusion, and you laugh at it. . . . The idea of most Protestants is that we profess that all priests are angels, but that really they are all devils. No, neither the one nor the other; if these Protestants came to us and asked, they would find that we taught a far different doctrine—viz., that priests were mortal men who were intrusted with high gifts for the good of the people, that they might err as other men, that they would fall if they were not watchful, that in various times and places large numbers had fallen, so much so, that the priesthood of whole countries had before now apostatized, as happened in England three centuries ago, and that at all times there was a certain remnant scattered about of priests who did not live up to their faith and profession," etc.

"But not in one or two points merely," continues Cardinal Newman, "but in everything we think and say and do, as Catholics, were we but known, what a reformation would there not at once follow in the National mind in respect to us! British fair dealing and good sense would then recover their supremacy; and Maria Monks and Teodores would find their occupation gone. \* \* \* There would be no more dread of being

burned alive by Papists, or of the gutters overflowing with Protestant blood. Dungeons, pulleys, racks, and quicklime would be like the leavings of a yesterday's revel. Nor would the political aims and plots and intrigues, so readily imputed to us, seem more substantial \* \* \* This indeed would be a short and easy way, not of making Protestants Catholics, but of reversing their ridiculous dreams about us,—I mean, if they actually saw what they so interminably argue about."

Yes; truly this was a "consummation devoutly to be wished," and this was the consummation which Sir Walter succeeded, to a considerable extent, in bringing about. He made his narrow, bigoted readers better acquainted with Catholics generally; made them familiar with such valiant, stout-hearted, long-suffering and high-principled men and women as Sir Frederick Vernon and Diana; he showed that priests, and even monks, can be real red blooded, genuine, thorough-going men—men, moreover, of sound character and high principles, men of culture and refinement. He opened the eyes of the hitherto purblind British Philistines to the fact that even the "crafty, intriguing Jesuit" can be very human, now and then, with a considerable modicum of human feeling and human virtue. He did even more than the scant justice for which Newman so pathetically pleads: for, with a comparatively few exceptions, (as I have tried to make clear in the course of this article) his Catholic heroes and heroines are not merely real men and women—instead of gargoyles, as the average English Protestant mind was wont to imagine them—but, taken all in all, genuinely good, high-grade men and women.

Until this much was accomplished, there was no earthly use in trying to get a hearing for the doctrines of the Church; it was utterly out of the question. No Catholic writer could have done what Scott did, because, in the first place, he could not have secured the audience; and next, because even the very few who condescended to read his apology would naturally have suspected him of bias and partisanship. Sir Walter, with his immense personal popularity, and the wide popularity of his novels, a Protestant born and bred and beyond suspicion, was the one man to do the deed, and—credit or no credit—he did it. The

very apology he made for treating, as he did, of Catholic times and persons and manners, the antiquarianism which he pleaded (in the words of Newman) "in extenuation of his prevarication," aye, his very onslaughts on "Romanism" only served, most unexpectedly, perhaps, to further the cause. And sometimes, in the very midst of his tirades against the doctrines and practices of the Church he is irresistibly impelled to pay his little tribute of admiration to the beauty, the dignity and solemnity of Catholic worship, and the tastefulness and appropriateness of Catholic architecture. In *The Lady of the Lake* his antiquarianism inspires him to pen one of the most tender and touching of hymns to the Mother of God. Can anyone doubt that all these little side-lights produced their effect—not immediately evident, perhaps, but bound to tell in the long run?

The superficial observer may not be able to see much of the "Catholic tendency" either in Scott or his works; but, surely, no one in the wide world was more competent to give an opinion on this subject than Cardinal Newman, and Newman asserts that Scott did have Catholic tendencies. It has been shown clearly enough, from the author's own works, that these tendencies are not to be found in his attitude towards Catholic doctrines and practices, but that they are to be found, most decidedly, in his pictures of Catholic life and character. This phase of the great novelist's work was—as the quotations from "The Present Position of Catholics in England" show—Newman's chief desideratum as an opening-wedge into the stony heart of the prejudiced British Protestant nation; and it is more than probable that it was precisely this feature the Cardinal had in mind in referring to "Scott's Catholic Tendencies."

JOHN E. GRAHAM.

## THE CONGESTED DISTRICTS IN IRELAND.

---

For a generation, and especially since the passage of the Act of 1903, there has been quietly going on in Ireland an agrarian revolution on a scale heretofore unknown in the world's history. By common consent landlordism is to give way to peasant proprietorship. British credit, prudently supported by Irish public funds, is being employed to make Irish tenants the owners of their lands. In 1911, of the 607,960 agricultural holdings in Ireland, 389,751 or 64 per cent. had become the property of former tenants while only 218,209 were still rented from landlords. In a few more years the process will be completed and Ireland will have passed the first milestone on the road to economic regeneration. In a few more years, that is, the process will be completed except for the congested districts.

When one hears for the first time of the congested districts in the west of Ireland, one is likely to conclude that that portion of the country is thickly populated. Congestion means overcrowding, and congested districts must therefore be overcrowded districts. But neither Ireland nor the west of Ireland is overcrowded. In 1801 there were in Ireland 166 persons to the square mile; in Scotland, 54; and in England and Wales, 153. In 1901 there were in Ireland 137 to the square mile; in Scotland, 150; and in England and Wales, 558. Relatively to area, Ireland is evidently not overpopulated. Again the "congested" counties of Ireland are not more densely populated than those which are not "congested." Thus the seven congested counties of Donegal, Sligo, Leitrim, Roscommon, Mayo, Galway and Kerry are given in the 1911 census as having a population of respectively 0.14, 0.18, 0.17, 0.16, 0.15, 0.13, and 0.14 persons to the acre, while the administrative counties (excluding county boroughs) of Dublin, Armagh, Down, Louth, Antrim, Monaghan, Cavan, Londonderry, Tyrone, and Wexford, have respectively 0.79, 0.39, 0.34, 0.32, 0.28, 0.23, 0.20, 0.20, 0.18, and 0.18, persons to the acre. It is evident that

the non-congested counties are more thickly populated than the congested counties. Congestion is not then simply a matter of overcrowding.

Essentially a congested holding is an uneconomic holding, *i. e.*, one where the tenant is not able to make a living by cultivating the land, whether because the land is too poor or the holding too small or for other cause. The problem of the congested districts is, in a word, to establish liveable conditions for the inhabitants. This may be done by getting them more land (either by breaking up a neighboring grazing farm or by migrating them a few miles to untenanted lands) or by improving the condition of their present holdings, as for example where the land is held in rundale or intermixed plots, by dividing the plots anew in such a way that each tenant will have all his land in one piece. Or, finally, industries may be established which will make it possible for some of the members of the family to occupy themselves with other employments than farming. The possibility of finding sufficient land for these tenants is readily apparent when one reflects that for the last half century there has been a constant driving of tenants away from the best lands of Ireland to furnish pasturage for cattle which are to be shipped abroad. Thus between 1855 and 1901, there was an increase of 65 per cent. in the acreage devoted to meadow while there was a decrease of 48 per cent., 90 per cent. and 35 per cent. respectively, in the area devoted to oats, wheat and potatoes.

Turning to the statutes for a definition of congestion, we find in section 36 of the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, under which the Congested Districts Board was originally established, the following: "Where at the commencement of this act more than 20 per cent. of the population of a county, or in the case of the county of Cork of either riding thereof, live in electoral divisions of which the total rateable value when, divided by the number of the population, gives a sum of less than one pound, ten shillings for each individual, those divisions shall for the purposes of this act be separated from the county in which they are geographically situate, and form a separate county (in this act referred to as a congested districts

county)" etc. The term "rateable value" refers to appraisal for purposes of local taxation and is roughly equal to the rental. Congestion, then, under the Act of 1891 referred to the relation between population and rental. In the Irish Land Act, 1903, the expression 'congested estate' means an estate not less than half the area of which consists of holdings not exceeding five pounds in rateable value, or of mountain or bog land, or not less than a quarter of the area of which is held in rundale or intermixed plots. The Irish Land Act, 1909, changes this definition of a congested estate by substituting seven pounds for five pounds, and defines a "congested holding" as "a holding not exceeding seven pounds in rateable value; or a holding held in rundale or intermixed plots." Finally, the Act of 1909 defines a "congested districts county" as one of the administrative counties of Donegal, Sligo, Leitrim, Roscommon, Mayo, Galway, and Kerry, or six certain rural districts of Clare or four of Cork.

At the present time the tenants of the congested districts find it necessary if they will continue to live on their holdings, to supplement the incomes from the land with money derived from other sources. From time immemorial the inhabitants along the coast have busied themselves with fishing and related industries as well as farming, but of late years these occupations have been closed to them for the reason that the fishermen were not able to provide the capital necessary to meet foreign competition. From all rural Ireland there is a heavy emigration to the New World and the congested districts furnish much more than their proportionate share of this emigration. The result is that almost every family is represented by strong young wage earners in America. These send back, yearly, immense sums to help their parents pay the rent for ground which will not itself produce the rent. Moreover, there is a large volume of migratory agricultural labor from these districts to Scotland and northern England. The Report on Irish migratory labor published by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, placed the number of these wandering laborers for 1905 at 14,830. This official estimate is undoubtedly too low; it is generally admitted that a correct estimate would be about

25,000. Of these three-quarters were natives of the provinces of Connaught, and over half of the total number came from the county of Mayo. Nearly 14 per cent. came from County Donegal. Synge (*Works*, iv, 180), in an account of a visit to Erris says: "A few days ago a special steamer went from Achill Island to Glasgow with five hundred of these laborers, most of them girls and young boys. From Glasgow they spread through the country in small bands and work together under a ganger picking potatoes or weeding turnips, and sleeping for the most part in barns and outhouses. Their wages vary from a shilling a day to perhaps double as much in places where there is more demand for their work. The men go more often to the north of England, and usually work together, where it is possible, on small contracts for piecework arranged by one of themselves until the hay harvest begins, when they work by the day. In both cases they get fairly good wages, so that if they are careful and stay for some months they can bring back eight or nine pounds with them."

The following extract from the Agricultural Department's Report gives a more detailed view of the conditions met with by these wanderers:

"The second group of migratory laborers is that of the Donegal men. . . . These men are engaged as harvesters and emergency workers, chiefly in the east of Scotland and in Northumberland. . . . The Donegal men begin to come to Scotland early in June, and many remain until a few weeks before Christmas. Some are employed on the same farms from June to December; others go from farm to farm in the hope of falling in with busy times and higher wages. . . . Most of the work is done by the piece or on special wages. Turnip singling and hoeing, potato-pitting, and pulling turnips or mangels, are usually done by the piece. . . . The working day is ten hours, but on piece work longer hours are frequently worked. Wages vary much more than among the Achill workers, and it is therefore difficult to generalize as to earnings; 4s. 6d. is considered a fair day's wage for turnip singling, and 5s. for potato-pitting and turnip or mangel pulling. When on time wages



the usual weekly pay is from 18s. to one pound, though in dull times wages will fall as low as 12s. In harvest time the practice is to pay a wage for the harvest month which works out commonly from one pound to 24s. a week together with a considerable allowance of food and drink, viz., bread and cheese, with beer or some other drinkable. When cutting, binding, and stacking corn by the acre, 4s. to 5s. a day is a common earning. . . . As regards the cost of living, the work being heavy and the hours long, and also there being less of the family and group system, the outlay for food is distinctly higher than among the Achill workers. It varies, of course, with individuals, and also with the extent to which food is supplied free by the farmer, but from 7s. to 9s. per week may be said to be a fair average cost. The savings of the Donegal workers are not easy to estimate, as these depend necessarily on the regularity of employment, the wages received, and the disposition of the individual workers, but so far as can be estimated, a good, steady worker, with fair luck, will save from 12 pounds to 15 pounds during the season of from five to six months. Some, however, make considerably greater savings."

Other sources from which income may be derived are such home industries as lace making and knitting. Then, too, there is turf-cutting and kelp-making and such public works as road making, bridge building and drainage. In times past the government spent considerable sums in road building without any other intelligent purpose than to give employment to the idle. These roads often begin nowhere and end nowhere, and are practically of very little use to the country as an investment. An account of an investment of a somewhat similar kind made by the Congested Districts Board on Clare Island about fifteen years ago is given as follows in the First Report (p. 101) of the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland:

2417. Mr. Sutherland.—Why was it found necessary to erect such a high wall separating the grazing from the arable land?

Answer. Because mountain sheep are very difficult to keep in bounds.

2418. Ordinary wire fencing would not have done?

Ans. Ordinary wire fencing would have done as well, in fact, better than walls; but I suggested that the Board should not put up wire fencing but have a wall erected and pay the people for making it. The wire fencing would have cost less, but the people would not have earned much on its erection. The tenants were told they would have to pay a certain sum in discharge of what they owed; they got a chance of earning that money on the construction of the wall.

2419. So it was not the sufficiency of the fence?

Ans. No; the construction of the wall represents the discharge of the arrears by the islanders.

2420. What did it cost?

Ans. About 1600 pounds.

2421. Sir Francis Mowatt.—What would wire fencing cost?

Ans. About 1000 pounds.

This brings us to the Congested Districts Board and its work. This Board which was established under the Act of 1891 is appointed by the Government and is non-political and non-partisan. There are upon it two or three men who are supposed to represent the interests of the selling landlords, and one or two who have been accused of being violent agitators in the interests of the purchasing tenants. But most of the members are actuated by sentiments of fair play and they have all been able to act harmoniously. Their weakness is the usual weakness of a body of non-experts giving only part of their time and attention to a difficult matter where expert knowledge and continuous attention are required. The purpose of the Board as set forth in the original Act was:

(a) Aiding migration or emigration from any congested electoral division and settling the migrant.

(b) Providing suitable seed potatoes and seed oats for sale to occupiers in any such electoral division, and

(c) Aiding and developing agriculture, forestry, the breeding of live stock and poultry, weaving, spinning, fishing (including the construction of piers and harbors, and the supply of fishing boats and gear, and industries connected with and subservient to fishing) and other suitable industries.

The work of the Board has been somewhat complicated by the fact that the Land Commission and the later Department of Agriculture had concurrent jurisdiction over much of their field. The land legislation of 1909 has done much towards obviating this difficulty: Since the persons to be helped are farmers, and the chief evil to be overcome is the lack of land, it would seem that the Board would achieve its greatest success in the work of migrating tenants to places where there is sufficient land to furnish economic holdings. The comparative lack of success which the Board has met with until recently has been due to a number of causes. In the first place it lacked the necessary funds to acquire the neighboring grazing lands to distribute among the congested tenants. This has been due to some extent to the confusion as to the jurisdiction of the Board. Again, as was naturally to be expected, before it received the power of compelling the landlords to sell, its work proceeded very slowly. But even with compulsory powers and since there has been plenty of money available, it is not able to progress rapidly with its work. When estates had been purchased by the Board, it has not always been found an easy matter to migrate tenants from other estates. The Board goes to considerable expense to improve the purchased estates by building fences and cottages and other outbuildings, and this requires a payment on the part of the incoming purchasers which cannot be met by every tenant. The most desirable tenants to move do not wish to leave their present homes, and those who are willing to move, are reluctantly accepted by the Board. Thus in the Eleventh Report of the Congested Districts Board (p. 23) we read: "Landholders in a congested district who have fairly large holdings and good means and who are the men we should like to migrate to larger and better holdings, will not leave their old homes. We are, therefore, obliged to migrate persons who have only small holdings to surrender for the benefit of their neighbors. These migrants are usually very poor and, having to borrow most of the capital they use, they are not, as a rule, disposed to undertake the purchase of a holding for which they would have to pay more than eight or ten pounds

annually. As the simplest class of house we can put up would be quite good enough for a farm having twenty pounds' worth of land, the cost of construction of mearing fences and buildings on these small holdings is altogether out of proportion to the value of the land attached. Very few of the migrants we can get will attempt to erect their own houses or make the mearing fences even though we offer them substantial grants in aid, especially if the land to which they intend migrating is any considerable distance from their homes. . . . An interesting case in connection with the disinclination to migrate, occurred on Port Royal estate, where two tenants on the mountain side of Derassa refused, three years ago, to migrate to good holdings on Port Royal demesne about three miles distant. They regretted this when they saw how well circumstanced those were who migrated to Port Royal, and last year they begged to be allowed, and were allowed, to migrate to farms on the Lucan estate, near Castlebar, about ten miles distant."

This was in 1902. The later Reports show a growing inclination to migrate. Thus in 1907 we read: "Since the meeting of the County Council (Mayo) a few landholders of considerably over twenty pounds rateable value have opened negotiations to surrender their holdings in the congested districts for holdings in Roscommon, and it is expected that terms will be arranged with some of them. Since then, also, a number of small landholders within a distance of twelve miles from these lands, have expressed their desire to migrate there.

"Our belief is that after some time the disposition to migrate will become more general."

The red tape and inefficiency so often characteristic of government action seem also to have stood in the way of the Board in the working out of its problem. It always meant well, but there was always some reason why it could not make the progress it intended. Thus in the Twelfth Report for 1903 (p. 17) we read: "The sales on the Dillon estate would have made more rapid progress, and, in fact, would have been almost complete at the end of the past year, if we could have obtained more skilled assistance from the Ordnance Survey Department in the

mapping of holdings and turbary plots. Only six surveyors were engaged on this work up to February last, when two were withdrawn. The vast amount of work entailed in these survey operations may be realized when we state that, on this estate more than 7,000 turbary plots require to be mapped and noted on the purchase agreements lodged at the Land Commission. These plots have to be noted on the agreements of both the tenants who have the right to cut turf and on the agreements of those other tenants on whose holdings the right is to be exercised." From the point of view of the practical man who fears that the country will be depopulated before the measures of relief are completed, it might be suggested that if it was really necessary to have the turbary rights settled with such exactness before purchase could be effected, it would be wiser to have employed an adequate number of surveyors rather than to let the work dawdle along without any prospects of completion within a reasonable period.

The next year we read of more delay due to the same cause. The Board's report (p. 15) says: "The Land Commission now require that the exercise of turbary rights and rights of way should be secured by special deeds, instead of having these rights set out in the land purchase agreements as heretofore. The preparation of these deeds and of the new forms of purchase agreement has caused much delay. Our chief remaining difficulty in getting sale-agreements signed is the absence of so many of the tenants during the summer months, when they are working in England and Scotland."

By the Act of 1909 the Land Commission was removed from competition with the Congested Districts Board in the Congested Districts counties, and the Board's annual income was very materially raised. At the same time the Board received compulsory powers for purchasing land. Under the new order of things the Board's staff has been enlarged and reorganized and its work has gone on more satisfactorily than before, but there is still much to be desired. From all sides there are complaints that the Board is not getting its work done rapidly enough. A circular letter which the secretary of the Board sends out to

those who make complaints of this kind and from which the following extracts are made shows that the Board feels that it is on the defensive in the matter.

“Congested Districts Board for Ireland,  
23 Rutland Square, Dublin.

Sir,

With reference to your recent inquiry, I am directed by the Congested Districts Board for Ireland to inform you that, owing to the large number of letters which they receive asking the same or similar questions, it has been deemed advisable to afford to those interested in the sale and resale of land in Congested Districts, some information of a general kind as to the procedure of the Board in such matters. . . . They hope that the tenants and their advisers will realize that it is not possible to have all the unsold land in the Congested Districts Counties purchased and resold in a short time; and that the best way to hasten land purchase is to co-operate with the Board in dealing with the difficulties which arise in negotiating for the purchase of estates, the rearrangements of holdings, and the distribution of untenanted land for the relief of congestion. . . . In conveying this intimation of the general policy which will continue to guide the Board in the discharge of their obligations, it is necessary to point out that the purchase and resale of estates in the Congested Districts must be a gradual process extending over many years. Illegal combination against the payment of rent to the landlord pending the valuation of the estate by the Board, or the prevalence of intimidation in any form, will inevitably have the effect of delaying indefinitely, instead of hastening, the purchase of any estate on which these illegal practices prevail.”

This warning against boycotting is probably due to the fact that one of the judges in the Land Court had on several occasions accused the Board of inciting tenants to boycott in order to depress the value of the land they were attempting to purchase.

From a Parliamentary Return made by the Estates Com-

missioners up to March, 1911, it was estimated that the unsold land in the Congested Districts amounted to 2,500,000 acres. The purchase money required for this land was estimated at 17,500,000 pounds. According to the Congested Districts Board's report for 1912, there had been purchased prior to the Act of 1909, 497,484 acres at a cost of 2,260,551 pounds. Under the Act of 1909 the Board had purchased 610,703 acres at a cost of 2,599,898 pounds. At the rate of purchase before the legislation of 1909, it would take nearly a century to complete the purchase. Under the more recent Act progress is more satisfactory but it will still be many years before this part of the problem is solved. When it is solved, much of the richest land in western Ireland, which is now used to raise cattle to ship abroad, will be devoted to raising grain for home consumption. At the time of the great famine in Ireland in the middle of the last century, men starved, not because the Creator had withheld His bounty; for there was at all times a plenty and a variety of food in the island; but because property rights had developed adipose tissue which prevented their proper functioning. The present revolution in land tenure does not aim to destroy property rights, but rather to readjust them in such a way that they may be able to do their work properly, namely that they may subserve human life.

In the inland districts of the congested counties the problem of putting within the possession of the people the possibility of making a decent living will be pretty nearly solved when their holdings have been enlarged by the additions taken from the grazing lands of the neighborhood. The problem of the coast dwellers, however, does not admit of such simple solution. For them untenanted land is wanting, and various industries must be developed so that they may have an opportunity of earning the means of their support. Of these industries the most important for some time to come will be fishing and its allied activities, such as the curing of fish, boat-building, and barrel-making.

The Board is endeavoring to rehabilitate the fishing industry by introducing the use of suitable fishing craft. Last year it

had a fleet of 73 sailing boats let out to fishermen on the share system. The usual and most satisfactory form of contract provides that one-third of the earnings shall go to the Board in payment for the boat, fishing gear, etc., and two-thirds to the crew. These sailing vessels are engaged nearly altogether in the herring fishery and have done very well. The Board has also bought two steam drifters as a cost of about 3,000 pounds apiece. Each of these employs from six to ten fishermen and they have proved a profitable investment. There is the objection to them, however, that they tie up a large amount of the Board's capital and furnish employment to a relatively small number of men. There is the same objection, though in a lesser degree, to the purchase of the motor boats which the Board has acquired at a cost of about 1,250 pounds each.

Some years ago mackerel fishing was an important industry to the fishermen and fish merchants of Cork, Kerry, Clare, and Galway. The fish were sent fresh to the English market and were in great demand. More recently Cornishmen have invaded this market and through quicker service and lower freight rates were able to get their fish to the English markets in a better condition and at a lower cost than was possible for the Irish fishermen. Accordingly, the Irish industry fell into decay. The Board is now taking steps to regain this lost ground and to re-develop mackerel fishing. Because of the unsatisfactory condition of the transportation service they do not hope for the present to be able to get the fish to the English market in a fresh condition and cheaply, and therefore they are endeavoring to establish a market in America for cured mackerel. The Norwegians have now a strong foothold in this market and the Irish hope to learn from them the secret of their success. The Irish mackerel are better in quality than those furnished by the Norwegian fishing boats, but the Norwegians have given more attention to the grading and shipping of the fish than have the Irish. Moreover, the Norwegians have the business of packing the fish better organized than have the Irish, and the Norwegian product is taken care of with less delay and in a fresher condition than are the Irish fish. The Board, by furnishing boats and nets and ice and barrels, but above all, by



furnishing Norwegian expert instruction, hopes to put the Irish product on a footing of commercial equality with the Norwegian in the markets of the United States and thus to furnish means of employment to many of these western fishermen.

The problem of keeping the women in the country is just as important as that of keeping the men, if Ireland is to remain Irish. According to the last census, the Province of Connaught loses annually to foreign countries 3,649 males and 3,949 females. For the County of Mayo the numbers were respectively 1,237 and 1,544. The Board has attempted to counteract this outflow of women by furnishing instruction and opportunity to earn money in such occupations as lace making, crocheting, knitting, and weaving.

For the year ending 31 March, 1912, the earnings of the lace and crochet classes amounted to 30,616 pounds. This was an increase of 3,000 pounds over the preceding year. Of this amount 16,377 was earned in County Mayo. Beginning classes in this work show a very low earning capacity as compared with those longer established and hence it is hoped that within a few years when the many classes that have recently been started become more adept at the work, the returns to the workers will be a very substantial amount. Classes in knitting have been organized especially in Donegal. There has grown up a very considerable demand for knitted golf-coats and other similar articles. At first the demand was for hand-knit articles but recently machine-knit coats are desired and the Board is considering the introduction of knitting machines. Commercial firms purchase the work of the girls who are thus employed and the earnings appear to be satisfactory to the workers. Weaving has also received a new impetus and at the three principal tweed markets in Donegal, 3,745 rolls of tweed were sold at the price of 16,915 pounds. Nine teachers were employed during the year in giving instruction in cookery, laundry, housewifery, and dressmaking.

These, then, are the means which the Board is taking to revive Irish economic life: first, annulling the divorce of the people from the land; and second, building up industries so that those who have not land may co-operate with those who have in

a common national economic life. When the tenants have bought their land, they will pay considerably less in yearly interest to the government than they have been paying in yearly rent. This is as true for all Ireland as for the Congested Districts. The difference between the former rent and the present interest and sinking fund charge represents net gain to the tenant purchaser. He can use this difference to improve his buildings, to stock his farm, or to improve his standard of living. As time goes on this difference will increase until finally with the complete amortization of the purchase money, he can use the whole of his former rent payment in improving his condition. Nor will this be the only advantage of purchase. Formerly the tenant dared not improve his holding lest the landlord should raise his rent. With the passage of the Fair Rent Clause of the Act of 1881, the tenant was assured against arbitrary assessment by the landlord, but there was an inducement to neglect the improvement of his holding in order that the Land Court might reduce his rent. With peasant proprietorship the owner will have every inducement to put his heart into his work, for he will know that the product of the work will be his.

Again, with the development of industries, it is hoped that not only the Congested Districts but all parts of Ireland will be able to keep their population at home. The fear has been expressed over and over again that by the time Ireland becomes a nation there will be no Irishmen left. With the present heavy emigration and the lowest birth rate in Europe with the exception of that of France, this is not such an absurdity as it might seem at first sight. But if Ireland can build up the industries which will supplement her agriculture, there will be an increasing demand for her younger sons and daughters at home and she can devote her energies to populating her own rather than foreign cities.

Of course, Ireland is not alone with her problems of poverty. Scotland too, has her "congested districts" and England is not without plague spots much worse than the worst to be found in Ireland. Even in our own rich country, there are people who must go to bed supperless. Ireland, like every other

country which enjoys the blessings of modern civilization, must be continually on guard to see that the institution of private property which has done such magnificent work in leading the nations out of savagery does not become an engine of oppression to drive a part of the population to lower depths than those from which the race has emerged.

In conclusion it may be said that no economic problem is merely an economic problem. It is likely to be also an educational problem, or a moral problem, or a religious problem, or a broadly social problem or several of these together. The problem of the congested districts of Ireland is no exception. Its final solution will depend as much on Ireland's keeping a clean and a courageous heart as upon her securing her land purchase money at a low rate of interest. The Irish nation can not hope to be saved unless Irishmen, first of all, are made to realize why the saving is worth while.

FRANK O'HARA.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**The Catholic Church the True Church of the Bible**, by Rev. C. J. O'Connell. St. Louis, 1913. 8vo, 346 pp., \$1.25 net.

A common objection made against the Catholic Church by uneducated Protestants is that the Church is strenuously opposed to the reading of the Bible by the faithful, lest the latter become aware of the inconsistency of Catholicity with the teachings of Holy Scripture and thereby give up the faith of their fathers.

It is to the task of refuting this false notion that the author of the above-mentioned book applies himself. He shows conclusively that the Bible was committed to the care of the Church, that it is through her authoritative teaching that we come to recognize the Bible as the inspired word of God, that, as it is not self-interpreting, it needs to be read under the guidance of that same authoritative and infallible teaching, that when thus safeguarded and properly translated, the Bible has always been used for the instruction and edification of the faithful, and lastly that perfect harmony exists between Holy Scripture rightly interpreted and the teachings and practices of the Catholic Church. Most of the thirty chapters which make up the volumes are devoted to this last point. Thus we have as heads of chapters, the Bible and Tradition, the Bible and Primacy, the Bible and Infallibility, the Bible and the Blessed Virgin. The author has shown considerable diligence in culling for each topic the pertinent passages of Holy Scripture from both the Old and the New Testament. The general result is a solid presentation of the argument from Scripture, though with more care greater neatness and precision might have been attained. In the chapters, the Bible and Infallibility, and the Bible and Private Interpretation, the author repeats to some extent what he has already said in the opening chapters on the Church and the Bible. He hardly needed to devote thirty long pages to the refutation of the trite and antiquated question of St. Peter's presence and death in Rome. Now and then, as on page 70, for example, he is betrayed into a severity of language not calculated to conciliate the Protestant reader. Lack of logical order is glaringly conspicuous in the arrangement of the chapters, the titles of which

seem to follow one another haphazard. On page 189 he should have given his authority for the sentence, which many of his readers will be disposed to call in question, "The ancient Jewish Rabbis commented on them (the words, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts), 'Holy is the Father, holy is the Son, and holy is the Holy Ghost.'"

But these are minor faults, which do not tell against the seriousness and usefulness of the volume.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Spiritism Unveiled**, by D. I. Lanslots, O. S. B. St. Louis, Herder, 1913. 12mo, 216 pp., \$.75 net.

The phenomena of spiritism have been of late years subjected to a great amount of critical investigation. The investigators are not agreed as to the satisfactory way of accounting for them. Some set them down to trickery and fraud, evidences of which have been frequently revealed in spiritualistic séances. Others hold that they are in part at least the extraordinary results of the operation of psychic and other natural forces not yet fully studied and known. Others still see in them the agencies of departed and harmless souls, while not a few Christian thinkers are convinced that they are the work of wicked demons.

It is to this latter class that the author belongs. He logically concludes that where communications of an indisputably *praeter-natural* character are made, which are in open contradiction to one or more teachings of divine revelation, they must be set down to the agency of evil, lying spirits. He is led to conclude that where these *praeter-natural* manifestations are of a harmless nature, purporting to reveal the presence of departed relatives and friends, they are nevertheless the outcome of demoniac deceit.

Of the sincerity of the author there can be no question, but more than one reader will be inclined to ask if too ready a credence has not been given to some of the alleged marvels wrought in spiritual séances, which we find recorded in this book on rather slender testimony. As an example take what he says on page 43 in regard to the feats of which the medium is capable:—"Like the objects, so also is the body of the medium raised, either on his chair or on the table, and seen rising as high as the ceiling; he remains suspended for a few minutes, and around his head or his whole body may be seen a luminous halo. He is then lowered by the mysterious

force either slowly or swiftly, and carried towards a closed window, which opens by itself. He then makes a few turns in the air, and re-enters the room by another window, which opens before him, to the great wonder and astonishment of all present. This feat may be repeated several times at the same séance." On passages like this no comment is needed.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Looking on Jesus, the Lamb of God**, by Madame Cecilia.  
New York, Benziger Brothers, 1912. 12mo, 425 pp. \$1.75  
net.

No little credit is due Madame Cecilia for having composed this volume. It is a book of meditations on various events in the last three years of the life of Jesus. Thanks to her careful preparation, she has risen above the level of dullness, which is too often characteristic of works of this kind. She writes in a pleasing style. Her abundant and apt citations of inspired texts give evidence of a wide acquaintance with the books of the Old and New Testament. Through the studious use of standard works on the topography of the Holy Land, and on the sacred rites and customs of the Jewish people in the time of our Lord, she has succeeded in giving a well-defined local setting to many of her subjects for meditation, a thing which helps greatly to lend interest to what she has to say. Her moral applications and lessons are generally well chosen and to the point. The book is excellently printed, on paper of very light weight, and is thus easy to handle. Despite the careful work of the proof-reader, there is a typographical error in the preface, where the author quotes the Latin text of Psalm 63:3. We here read "In terra deserta et in via inaquosa." It stands rightly quoted on page 23, "In terra deserta et in via et inaquosa."

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Jésus-Christ, Sa Vie Et Son Oeuvre**, par M. Lepin. Paris,  
G. Beauchesne, 1912. 12mo., 269 pp.

To all who read French and are interested in a succinct, well-arranged, and carefully prepared account of the public preaching, death, and resurrection of our blessed Lord, we commend the pre-

sent volume. It opens with a scholarly treatise of fifty-seven pages on the genuineness and historic value of the four gospels, the chief sources from which our knowledge of Christ is drawn. In the six chapters which follow, the author gives a remarkably clear presentation of the doings and sayings of Jesus in the three years of his public ministry, culminating in his tragic death and glorious resurrection. He writes like a scholar, in simple, easy style, avoiding rhetorical embellishments and amplifications. At the end is a valuable list of Catholic works in French to serve as books of reference.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**A Loyal Life:** A Biography of Henry Livingston Richards, with Selections from his Letters and a Sketch of the Catholic Movement in America. By Joseph Havens Richards, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Herder, St. Louis, 1913. 8°. Pp. 10 + 397.

The subject of this memoir was born of Puritan ancestry in Granville, Ohio, in 1814. His education was the best to be had in the immediate neighborhood of his place of birth. His early training and career were typical of that of numbers of young men at the beginning of the last century. What is of general interest in the book, outside of the record of a disinterested life, is the manner in which knowledge of the Catholic Church penetrated at the time of Mr. Richards' conversion, to circles in which Catholicism was unknown or, if known, very cordially detested. Though Mr. Richards' career is traced through its various stages it would be hard to say what was the dominating motive which led him to sever old associations, suffice it to say, that Catholic influence found fruitful soil in his soul. His conversion was whole-hearted. His useful labors for the Church and truth are too well known to need repetition. This biography as might be expected reveals an intimate knowledge of the life and aims of Mr. Richards which adds to its charm and value.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**The Government of the Church in the First Century: An Essay on the Beginnings of the Christian Ministry.** Presented to the Theological Faculty of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, as a Thesis for the degree of Doctor. By Rev. William Moran. Dublin, Gill & Son, 1913. 8°. Pp. vii + 288.

The short period dealt with in this work offers problems intricate enough and vital enough for several volumes. The author has followed a commendable plan in confining himself to essentials. The timeliness of such a study will be admitted by all. As with other departments of ecclesiastical life and activity the organisation of the Church, at the hands of some critics, loses all character of originality and is resolved into a fortuitous union of existent elements brought together as a result of a natural evolution in things social and political. Considering the limits imposed on him, the author has met his opponents fully and not inconclusively. In fact his care to lose no point of an argument obscures at times the general trend of his thought. The subject of early Church organisation is one that has never lost its compelling interest, and it is to be hoped that the author will continue his researches in a field where so much remains to be done.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

**Paul Allard: Les Esclaves Chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'Eglise jusqu'à la Fin de la Domination Romaine en Occident.** Ouvrage Couronné par l'Académie Française. Cinquième édition entièrement refondue. Paris, Lecoffre (J. Gabalda), 1914. 12mo, xiii + 484.

When the first edition of this work appeared in 1876 the author had in mind to vindicate for the Church the honor of having brought about the amelioration in the condition of the servile classes in the Roman Empire which led to the gradual abolition of slavery. At that time Rationalism was giving the credit for this transformation to Reason as exemplified in the teachings of the Stoic school. The investigations of Allard and others proved the baselessness of this latter claim. Since that time history and philosophy of history have gone through many forms and nowadays, instead of reason, economic pressure and change are put forward by many authors as the source of social upheaval and the dominant



factor of life. M. Allard has revised the work to meet these fresh antagonists. He aims at showing that moral and religious influences in the strict sense of the terms, not material necessity, are responsible for the new ideas of civilization which rooted out slavery. Though following the main outlines of the earlier editions the work has been re-cast to elucidate the new phase of the problem. After a profound and searching analysis of the conditions, social, intellectual and economic which prevailed at the time of the founding of the Church, and having traced in detail the steps by which the slave was recognised as a human being with a conscience and supernatural destiny, he shows that the legal and political betterment which the fourth and fifth centuries reveal were a direct response to the teaching and practice of the Church. The work is decidedly a masterly piece of constructive historical apologetic.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**L'Edit de Calliste:** Etude sur les Origines de la Pénitence Chrétienne. Par A. D'Ales. Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne, 1914. Large 8°. Pp. vii + 484.

The import and character of this work are best expressed in the secondary title. Far from confining himself to the discussion of the famous "Edict of Callistus," the author uses it as the centre for a general examination of the history of Penance and the Penitential Discipline of the early Church. Two main ideas form the subject matter: viz., Christian tradition bears witness to the belief that God offered pardon for all sins, no matter what their number or their character, and; the Church has always claimed the right to "oversee" this pardon. Both are inseparable: the texts which refer to the one imply the other. No attempt is made to write a general history of penance but the whole field is carefully examined with a view to testing the validity of some modern hypotheses, which deny or invalidate one of the foregoing propositions. The Edict of Callistus is made prominent from the fact that in our days many authors assert that up to the time of Callistus the three capital sins, Murder, Adultery and Apostasy were irremissible. Pope Callistus, it is claimed, made the first innovation by permitting the reconciliation of those who were guilty of adultery and fornication. Pope Cornelius extended the milder discipline to the apostates of the Decian persecution, and at a subsequent date homicide was removed from the category of unpardonable sins. St.

Callistus was censured for his action by his contemporaries Tertullian and Hippolytus. Because of this censure some non-catholic writers assert that the church was not conscious from the beginning of its power to forgive all sins. There are Catholic authors who have thought that the church though fully cognizant of the extent of the power of the keys, did not for prudential reasons use this power in regard to the capital sins until the time of Callistus. The author of this monograph combats both views. Tracing the doctrine of Penance from the gospels downwards, he carries his investigations through the post-apostolic period and the second century, with the result that he finds a uniform tradition witnessing to the belief that divine pardon was offered for all sins, and that this pardon was to be dispensed by the church. Rome, Antioch, Corinth and Alexandria all offer testimony to this tradition and to the belief that the divinely appointed hierarchy administered pardon for sins. The author continues his examination of the question by a thorough analysis of the works of Tertullian and Hippolytus bearing on the subject, and completes his work by examining the writings of Origen and the history of the Lapsi in the time of Decius. Penitential Rigorism in the fourth and fifth centuries forms the subject of the last chapter. There are three useful appendices. The third *l'élément privé dans l'ancienne pénitence*, deals with some of the theories of Henry C. Lea.

The author is to be congratulated for the manner in which he has dealt with a subject of living interest to Catholics and for the learning displayed in dealing with one of the actual problems of this day. His general conclusion is reassuring. He gives no ground for adherence to any of the theories which are opposed to the traditional views on the Penitential discipline in the first three centuries. The Power of the Keys was recognized in the time of Callistus as it had been before him, and it was not only recognized but exercised.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**Umbria, Past and Present:** By Mary Lovett Cameron. London, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1913. Pp. xx + 324.

The sympathetic and scholarly interest in the life and work of St. Francis of Assisi which is so remarkable a feature of our day has, doubtless, done much to bring Umbria and things Umbrian into the foreground of recent historical and literary study.

Umbria past and present has already found her English interpreters in the Cruikshanks, Hutton, Symonds, Goff, Potter, Duff-Gordon, and others whose writings have invested the leaders of her literature and art with a new halo of fascination and romance. In the volume before us we are told (p. xvii), that "the moment seems to have come to snatch the vanishing charm of the old Italy and, before old landmarks are effaced, old customs omitted, and old traditions forgotten, attempt to perpetuate a few of the interesting and picturesque features, which are still existing." With this object in view, Miss Lovett Cameron takes us to Spoleto, Todi, Gubbio, Spello, Montefalco and other ancient Umbrian towns and it is with something more than mere geographical knowledge that she tells us of their saints and poets and painters with the grand spirit of the Mediæval period brooding over them all. The author has devoted a separate chapter (IX), to the City of Assisi, but we doubt if she is well-advised in questioning, as she does (p. 167), the authenticity of the famous frescoes in the upper church of S. Francesco there as the work of Giotto. The chapter (VII) on Umbrian Art seems to need enlargement: Perugino, Pinturicchio and Raphael, to name no others, are surely deserving of more than passing mention. On the other hand, the present volume is specially strong on the Industries, Guilds and Confraternities of Umbria. Particular attention is also paid to the feasts and fairs which are closely connected in Umbria; the great annual Procession of the Ceri at Gubbio and the more familiar feast of the *Perdono d'Assisi* or Porciuncola Indulgence being well described in chapter III. Miss Lovett Cameron has done well in giving prominence (pp. 244-52) to the strange story of Jacopone da Todi whose "poems are among the greatest mystic poetry of that age of mysticism": we only wish we were half as sure as she appears to be that Jacopone composed the celebrated "Stabat Mater." But the author relies, for the most part, on sound authorities and her book, taken as a whole, is a very good piece of work. Although it does not, indeed, throw much new light upon the story of Umbria past and present, it is, nevertheless, a most interesting and instructive contribution to our knowledge of the subject. A series of twenty-five characteristic drawings and of fifteen well chosen photographs add to the attractions of the book which those about to visit Umbria should by all means take with them.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### **Knights of Columbus Endowment Fund.**

On Tuesday, January 6th, the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus met by appointment His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons at his residence, to present him with the Knights of Columbus Endowment Fund of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars for the Catholic University of America, which the Order has been collecting during the last four years.

The visitors assembled in the red and blue rooms, which for the purpose had been turned into one, shortly before one o'clock: Cardinal Gibbons sat at one end of the red room, with James A. Flaherty, of Philadelphia, supreme knight on his right and Michael Jenkins, treasurer of the Catholic University, on his left. Nearby were Archbishop Prendergast, of Philadelphia; Bishop O'Connell, of Richmond; Bishop Corrigan, of Baltimore; Ex-Ambassador to Vienna, Richard C. Kerens, of St. Louis; Monsignor Shahan, rector of the Catholic University, and the Very Rev. Dr. George A. Dougherty, vice-rector; Rev. Dr. William A. Fletcher, rector of the Cathedral; Rev. P. J. McGivney, of Bridgeport, Conn., national chaplain of the Knights of Columbus.

The members of the Supreme Council in attendance were as follows:

Martin H. Carmody, of Grand Rapids, deputy supreme knight; William J. McGinley, of New Haven, supreme secretary; D. J. Callahan, of Washington, supreme treasurer; Joseph Pelletier, of Boston, supreme advocate; Dr. E. W. Buckley, of St. Paul, supreme physician, and Thomas J. McLaughlin, of Newark, N. J., supreme warden.

Directors of the Knights of Columbus: George F. Monaghan, of Detroit; J. J. McGraw, of Ponca, Okla.; James Maher, of Chicago; William F. Fox, of Indianapolis; Clarence E. Martin, of Martinsburg, W. Va.; D. J. Griffin, of Brooklyn; W. H. Gulliver, of Portland, Me.; John F. Martin, of Green Bay, Wis.; John H. Reddin, of Denver; W. D. Dwyer, of St. Paul; Dr. N. A. Dussault, of Quebec, and Paul Leche, of Donaldsonville, La.

Mr. Flaherty, speaking in the name of the Order, addressed His Eminence as follows:

"In reverence to the Catholic University of America, founded by the late lamented Leo XIII, in devotion to the interests of Catholic education, in sympathy with the designs and wishes of the Hierarchy, but most of all in the fulness of our personal love and affection for our beloved, the peoples' beloved, Cardinal Gibbons, we have come here today to redeem the promise made to your Eminence to raise the sum of a half million of dollars for the Catholic University of America.

"It is the offering of three hundred thousand Knights of Columbus in the cause of education and Catholic truth and I may truly say in their names that, while it represents some labor, some sacrifice, right willingly they make the endowment for the cause of Catholicism, and, as an evidence of their love for the Order's first and greatest friend in the person of Your Eminence.

"To emphasize perhaps the personal element, we have asked that the fifty scholarships to be awarded by the University shall be given to the nominees of your Eminence, knowing and feeling that as the interest and welfare of the Church in the United States have been so carefully guarded and guided during many years by Your Eminence, so our Order and this Endowment will have the benefit of your wisdom and advice.

"The gathering of this fund has rested largely in the hands of a Committee wisely appointed by my predecessor, that great leader of men, Past Supreme Knight Edward L. Hearn. The Committee has worked hard and today's presentation is evidence of their success. I am proud to say they are here with us and to call upon the Chairman, Brother Edward H. Doyle, of Detroit, to make the presentation."

Mr. Doyle, who is also Commissioner of Banking for the State of Michigan, said:

"Your Eminence,

The suggestions of His Grace, Most Reverend Archbishop Glennon, at Norfolk, Va., a few years ago to the National Convention of the Knights of Columbus, that the Order do something worth while for the promotion of higher education surely took root—the result of which we celebrate today.

"Later on, Mr. Wade, of St. Louis, Mr. Hart, of Philadelphia, and myself were chosen a Committee by that great leader Brother

Edward L. Hearn, then supreme knight, whose ability and personality made the Order what it is today.

"Our instructions were to arrange a plan to raise five hundred thousand dollars from the membership of the Order for the Catholic University at Washington. We arranged a meeting about four years ago with His Eminence, and agreed on the plan whereby the Committee was to raise the amount named (\$500,000.00) and transfer the same, to be held under a joint agreement of the Trustees of the University and the Board of Directors of the Order, and in return the Order was to receive fifty (50) perpetual scholarships. This plan was ratified by the Trustees of the University.

"We are here today to present to Your Eminence, and to the Trustees of the University, Five Hundred Thousand Dollars, in high-class first mortgage underlying bonds. Mr. Pelletier will submit to you plans for the distribution of scholarships which have been approved by the Board of Directors of the Order.

"Our inspiration in beginning this work, aside from the splendid encouragement it would give to higher Catholic education, consisted in the pleasure it would surely afford our beloved Cardinal Gibbons, whose fondest hopes for the Catholic University are well-known to all; and as a final tribute to him the suggestion has come to us, that we provide a suitable dormitory at a cost of one hundred thousand dollars, to be erected on the University grounds to house our Scholarship students, and for such other use as the Right Reverend Rector of the University may desire. We will ask permission of the Supreme Board of Directors to raise this amount from the membership of the Order by voluntary assessment, or we will ask the Councils of the Order when they convene at St. Paul next August. We are satisfied it will be given cheerfully and quickly.

"Our Committee, Brother Hart and myself, therefore trust that we will be able to meet your Eminence and the Board of Trustees one year from today, January 6th, 1915, in this room (God willing) to turn over this amount to your building fund.

"Our Order stands for higher education and good citizenship, and it should be both an honor and privilege for each individual member to share in this great work for Church and State.

"A word about my associates on the Committee, and I am through. Much credit must be given Mr. Festus J. Wade, of St. Louis, one of the ablest financiers in the United States, for his part

in starting out right with plans acceptable to all. As for Mr. Philip A. Hart, no amount of credit could do justice to his unselfish devotion, ability and perseverance, and I want to thank him here, not only for what he did, but for the way in which he did it. Our work throughout has been extremely pleasant and harmonious, and the result is as gratifying to us as it must be to Your Eminence, to the University Trustees, and to the Membership of our honored Order."

In accepting the splendid gift of the Order Cardinal Gibbons replied as follows:

"My dear Mr. Flaherty: In my own name and in the name of the Trustees of the Catholic University of America I accept with mingled feelings of gratitude and affection the noble foundation of \$500,000 which, in the name of the Knights of Columbus, you now place in my hands for the perpetual education of 50 lay students in the Catholic University of America. Words fail at this moment to express my happiness at the accomplishment of the splendid task to which four years ago the Knights of Columbus pledged themselves with a generosity and elevation unique in history.

"I find only one parallel of your magnanimous deed, the building of a great mediæval cathedral by the loyal and devoted merchants' guild of those former Catholic days. In an age of spiritual unrest and despair you have renewed that miracle of faith—the steady and affectionate co-operation of a multitude of men in the fulfillment of one mighty purpose whose immortal influence shall run like a fertilizing river through all time and spread on all sides most welcome benefits.

"While the Catholic people in the United States have in the past created great and memorable works of religion, monuments of divine worship, charity and education, we assist now for the first time at the conscious exercise of a vast power for common Catholic welfare by a Catholic association which finds in itself the inspiration, the courage and the means to do for common interest a work of supreme importance that must forever loom great and striking in the annals of our beloved country. But generous as is this foundation, it is more praiseworthy by reason of its representative than by reason of its material value. It represents in high degree the faith, hope and charity that animate our Catholic life and lift it high above the level of imperfect natural order—faith

in the glorious educational mission of Catholicism in the United States; hope in its future achievements in every domain of national life; love for the unborn generations that they may run where we walked and that our foundation raise, in their day, new and imperishable works of incalculable service to religion and country.

"The Knights of Columbus take their place this day in the foremost rank of benefactors of humanity. What was formerly done by the great ones of this earth, the creation and endowment of higher institutions of learning and what in our own time has been the privilege of wealthy individuals, has, through you, been accomplished for the first time by the corporate efforts and sacrifices of Catholics associated for the highest interests, religious and civil. It is a splendid work of the new Catholic democracy that in our beloved country has been developing along lines of practical religion and unselfish patriotism. Surely it is a good omen of the future of your illustrious order that your two great efforts have been of an educational character, namely, the establishment at the Catholic University of the chair of American history and this new foundation of tenfold value. Both these great works express your profound interest in education and participation in a frankly religious education with which are so closely connected Christian convictions concerning God and religion, life and duty, the family and citizenship, science and morality, man and woman, the social and economic growth of mankind and the close relationship of this world and that which lies beyond the grave.

"It is also eminently fitting that so munificent a donation should be offered the Catholic University seeing that by an act of the Holy See and by the American Catholic hierarchy it is the chief Catholic educational centre in the United States and to it are attached so many ardent hopes for the future of American Catholic scholarship.

"I rejoice, moreover, that this foundation comes at a time of new and pleasing growth and development and when on all sides we behold the first fruits of the labors and sacrifices of the first generation. From the beginning the Knights of Columbus gave the University ample and generous evidence of sympathy and confidence, but with this endowment of \$500,000 they enter deeply into its constitution and by their munificent patronage smelt, so to speak, their own life with that of the University.

"My dear Mr. Flaherty, I thank you in the name of the Holy See and my colleagues on the Board of Trustees of the Catholic



University for this splendid endowment and particularly for the paternal interest it exhibits for the best possible education of our young Catholic laity, exposed as they are to so many dangers. To your unflagging zeal and your heartfelt sympathy it is owing that the interest of your Order in this grand work was never allowed to grow cold, though in this you are only foremost among the Knights, whose own zeal and devotion were ever nourished from your own generous heart.

“Nor can I forget the zeal of your predecessor, Mr. Hearn, under whom this endowment fund was started and who gave it an impetus it never afterwards lost. It is fitting also that with the heads of your illustrious order I should couple the name of Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis, who was first to propose to the Knights of Columbus this munificent undertaking, and whose confidence in your faith and generosity has been so splendidly justified and rewarded. In every common cause that calls for perseverance, patience and industry, courage and persistence, some leaders are chosen who sink themselves in the work and by absolute and unquestioning devotion fan the faith of their co-workers and feed their convictions with arguments and example, who rouse the weary and encourage activity and are living souls of enterprise. I have named Mr. Edward Doyle and Mr. Philip Hart, and in this hour of joy and triumph I extend to them my hearty congratulations on the success of their efforts and on the lasting benefits they have helped to confer on the Catholic Church in the United States through the successful establishment of the endowment fund.

“Their great work, however, could never have been accomplished without the steady co-operation of the State deputies, district deputies and grand knights all over this country, and to them also, as well as to the rank and file of the vast order, I express my profound gratitude and my undying esteem for the loyalty and high ideal they set themselves, their ardent and intelligent faith and their spiritual devotion to Christian education.

“Unselfish devotion, tireless activity, ever-flaming zeal can never be set down in cold print as they never can receive adequate reward. But rest assured, dear Mr. Hart and Mr. Doyle, that as long as the Catholic University endures, your names will be household words among the professors and students and will be forever coupled with that of the supreme knight and the entire member-

ship of your illustrious order which you represent with so much dignity and success."

After the presentation the Cardinal entertained the Supreme Council of the Knights at a dinner. There were present also Mr. James R. Wheeler, and Mr. T. Hubert Shriver, as guests of the Cardinal, besides Bishop O'Connell, of Richmond, Va., Bishop Corrigan, of Baltimore; Monsignor Shahan, rector of the Catholic University; Very Rev. George A. Dougherty, vice-rector; Rev. Dr. William A. Fletcher, rector of the Cathedral; Rev. P. C. Gavan, Chancellor of the Archdiocese; Rev. Louis O'Donovan and Rev. Louis Stickney, secretaries of the Cardinal.

At the end of the banquet His Eminence asked Dr. Fletcher to read the letters of regret and congratulation sent by several members of the Board of Trustees, including those of Cardinal Farley, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishops Glennon, Moeller, Blank, Keane, and several others. Among the telegrams received was the following from Ex-Senator Kearns of Salt Lake City.

"James Cardinal Gibbons,  
Baltimore, Md.

"Sorry I cannot be with you on sixth. Had I received notice earlier would have made every effort to get there. I congratulate you on the wonderful success you have had in building up the Catholic University of America, and trust that God will spare you to our people for twenty years and more. Not only your own people but all generous Americans regret that you are not back to fifty years of age, that you might be spared and assist in building up the greatest educational institution known to the civilized world. The Knights of Columbus who have so nobly got behind you and supported you deserve richly your blessing for their magnanimous gift. I hope they will continue to grow in numbers and influence and wealth, and will continue to support the one gracious Cardinal who will go down in the memory of generations as the greatest ecclesiastic of the twentieth century, who established the noble educational institution that stands for the faith of our fathers. May it continue to be supported by generations to come.

THOMAS KEARNS,  
Ex-United States Senator."

Cardinal Gibbons then introduced Monsignor Shahan, rector of the University, who spoke as follows:

"Your Eminence, Mr. Flaherty:

"It is with great emotion that I rise to thank the Knights of Columbus for the monumental foundation that they now present to the Catholic University of America.

"The great work that stands accomplished today is yet too new to measure its full value, too near us to appreciate its entire significance, too recent to gauge all the results that must henceforth flow from such a deep source. Time alone will reveal the value, significance and results that we now grasp vaguely and as it were in outlines only.

"If we consider this magnificent foundation as a work of education it is not merely a fixed number of educational opportunities that you secure to the Catholic lay youth of the United States, but a genuine college that you have this day founded, a Knights of Columbus College, with the fulness of means, security of duration, and unity and solidarity of purpose that mark the collegiate foundations in the older Catholic universities. When Robert Sorbonne in the thirteenth century founded the college that yet rises splendid and imposing in the heart of Paris; when Cardinal Albornoz in the fourteenth century founded at Bologna the Spanish College which yet sends forth its students, and when Cardinal Capranica in the fifteenth century founded at Rome the college which yet educates young men along the lines he laid down, they conceived nothing greater, nothing more potential in service, or more helpful to the youth of their time. By this act the Knights of Columbus take their place among the world's supreme benefactors if education be, as it truly is, the supreme social benefaction. This broad association of American Catholic citizens closes its first generation with a stupendous work of education that welds forever its interests, its very life, with the young University now growing along the Potomac, makes the University, as it were, its nursery and feeder, confides to it the choicest youth that the Order can select from its membership, and in turn binds itself to accept and spread the ideas for which the University stands, *i. e.*, the highest and purest concepts of religious and civil life. You have this day, therefore, immensely widened your scope, you have risen to a higher plane of vision, and have laid a shaping hand on the future.

Henceforth no history of American education is honest or complete which does not pay its tribute to your noble foundation and emphasize the several characteristics by which it stands original and unique among all the educational foundations that the world has yet seen. Indeed, what could be more interesting or instructive than its origin, its growth, and its completion,—a multitude of contributors, countless small sacrifices, made in faith and love, over a territory larger than the Roman Empire, rapid and simple and harmonious execution, intelligent grasp of a great idea by a huge army of men widely scattered, the sinking of local or sectional ideas in face of a noble inspiration. Truly, if this be the age of democracy, the Knights of Columbus have at the very outset made clear their will and their power to serve with perfect efficiency one of the highest interests of the Catholic Church, religious education.

“As a work of religion, this foundation is henceforth a potent agency of the Catholic Church in securing a religious training to a multitude of young men who might otherwise be deprived of that great blessing. They will come under the influence of Catholic teachers of distinction, whose lives are devoted to the sciences, but who acknowledge and teach as was once common in our American academic world but is so no longer, the true nature and rights of God in His own world, the beauty and services of the Christian order of life, the truth and power and charm of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the reality and the sanction of a moral order based on a Divine will. They will enter upon studies from which the name and idea of God are not systematically banished, nor will the class-room be a slaughter-pen of all the Catholic teaching they imbibed at the knees of their good mothers or learned in the schools of the Church. The Catholic religion, its spirit and purpose, its history and institutions, its ministers and services, will not be passed over in silence or treated with contempt, or slandered openly or secretly. During a full collegiate course these fortunate young men will undergo a natural and easy formation along the best lines of modern knowledge in all departments, but also in daily contact with ministers of the Catholic religion and with a multitude of other Catholic young men, amid the numerous and varied influence of a rich Catholic academic life. The holy inner life, the moral beauty, the thousand social merits and services of Catholicism, its patronage of all the arts, its scientific glories, its broad humane spirit, its love and service of the plain people, its

conquest of oppressors and tyrants, its peaceful, loyal and harmonious co-operation with the civil order, will be taught them by those who believe what they teach and find in their sympathetic hearts, not cold unfriendly words of forced avowal, but an earnest and inspiring language that forms the young heart and leads it ever to higher levels of endeavor and initiation. In other words, the young men of this foundation, and many others whom it will surely attract, will grow up in a Catholic atmosphere, *i. e.*, as far as lies in your power, in a warm and sweet sunlight of faith, a prolongation of the Catholic home and the Catholic school.

"In your great work patriotism claims no small place. You had already founded in the University a Chair of American History, and the study of our country's history and institutions is one of the conditions imposed on the students of this foundation. You have enriched the national capital by the perpetual presence of a large body of young American citizens drawn from every state in the Union, for whom their sojourn at Washington, will be in itself a liberal education. Nowhere else could ardent and impressionable youth acquire so easily correct ideas concerning the rich life of this great nation. Nowhere else are found in larger measure or more varied distribution the raw materials of higher studies, political, economic, and social. The complex life of the American people is mirrored at the national capital with absolute fidelity, and to this must be added such other advantages as academic peace, freedom from certain distractions and temptations that elsewhere assail the student, accessibility, excellent climate and sanitation, charming surroundings, in a word whatever could attract and retain studious youth and reassure their parents, guardians, and friends. Finally, a long and earnest training at the national capital is of itself the best corrective of too great narrowness in mental development, of too local a standpoint in the great questions, problems and interests of our American life.

"For your generous foundation, therefore, the Catholic University of America is profoundly grateful, and promises on its part to live up always to the letter and the spirit of your memorable donation. If it succeeds in training up for the great religious and civil purposes of your illustrious Order, men of the same calibre, mental and moral, as its first founders and administrators, it will have amply realized all the hopes that you now confide to us and that we accept with the greatest reverence and the deepest sense of our responsibility."

Other brief addresses were made by Bishop O'Connell of Richmond, and Bishop Corrigan, of Baltimore; Mr. Joseph Pelletier, of Boston; Mr. Philip S. Hart, of Philadelphia; V. Rev. Dr. George A. Dougherty; Rev. Dr. Wm. A. Fletcher and Rev. P. J. McGivney, National Chaplain. After the banquet the entire assembly was photographed, and the Presentation Committee took leave of His Eminence, with many expressions of satisfaction at the happy completion of their memorable task.

The fifty scholarships of the Endowment Fund are lay scholarships, and are eligible only to graduate students, that is, to those who have obtained the degrees, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or a corresponding degree. The candidates must be regularly Knights of Columbus or sons of Knights, and must contemplate going on for the Master's or Doctor's degree at the University.

The scholarships are during his lifetime in the gift of Cardinal Gibbons, but will be given out by competitive examinations, covering the entire membership of the Order, as far as practicable. All necessary information concerning the character, time, and place of the later examinations will be made public at a later date in the journals of the Order, and the Catholic press generally.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Public Lectures.** The following is the programme for the Course of Public Lectures in McMahon Hall for the Winter of 1913-1914.

January 15.—“The Temperance Movement in America.” Wm. DeLacy, D. C. L.

January 22.—“The Genius of Sophocles.” John Bartholomew O'Connor, Ph. D.

January 29.—“Exploring and Prospecting in the Congo and South Africa.” R. Dorsey Mohun, F. R. G. S.

February 12.—“Early Renaissance Architecture.” Frederick V. Murphy, A. I. A.

February 19.—“The Philosophy of Henri Bergson.” Rev. Chas. A. Du-bray, S. M., Ph. D.

March 5.—“St. Thomas and Social Justice.” Rev. James Fox, S. T. D.

March 12.—“The Anti-Intellectual Movement of our Times.” Rev. Edmund T. Shanahan, S. T. D.

March 19.—“The Temperance Movement in Europe.” Wm. DeLacy, D. C. L.

March 26.—“The Celtic Languages and the People who Speak them.” Joseph Dunn, Ph. D.

■ **Shahan Debating Society.** A series of debates preliminary to the Rector's prize debate, is now going on. The subject chosen for this year is, “Resolved, That the best interests of Society are served by public pensions to widows with young children.” The series will be continued through the coming term, and the final contest will be held shortly after Easter.

**Leo XIII Lyceum.** The Lyceum has spent a busy and profitable term. Arrangements were made at the first meeting (held on November 10) for an oratorical contest which will take place during the next semester. A handsome medal will be awarded to the winner.

On Sunday evening, November 16, the members listened with pleasure to a talk by Judge De Lacy, who took for his subject, “The Juvenile Court.” The speaker told some inter-

esting stories of the youthful offenders with whom he has come in contact. A talk by Judge De Lacy is always delightful and never fails to attract a large attendance.

Mr. Gregor Heine, '16, of Texan, Mexican, and *Symposium* fame, addressed the society at its next meeting. Mr. Heine spoke on "Mexico," and few natives could have done as well. A fact that we often forget, said the speaker, is that the majority of the population of Mexico is composed of Indians or their descendants. These people are, for the most part, illiterate—for appropriations for their education have a distressing habit of descending into private pockets.

Mr. Heine had some interesting things to say about the Aztec civilization. Tempered copper, and paper so durable that it has lasted to this day, have been found among the ruins of Aztec cities. What was probably the first parcel-post system was established by this remarkable people, and, under the circumstances, it was amazingly effective.

The speaker declared that our newspapers are treating Mexico unfairly. Many of them, actuated by interested motives, are clamoring for intervention on the part of Uncle Sam. They speak of "barbarous Mexico"; but progress is backward in Mexico largely because money intended for the education of the masses has made more than one unscrupulous politician the lord of vast European domains. Graft knows no race, no country; it is no new avenue to wealth; as old Cato said, two centuries before the Christian era, "Private thieves spend their lives in manacles, public thieves, in purple and gold."

On Sunday evening, November 30, the Lyceum was signally honored by the presence of Dr. McCabe, of Princeton University, and Mr. T. A. Gill, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland. Both of these gentlemen addressed the large gathering present in an interesting and instructive manner. Dr. McCabe took for his subject, "Princeton." The speaker described in detail the preceptorial system inaugurated there by President Wilson. This system has been productive of excellent results. The students have attacked their studies with increased zeal and have profited greatly from the weekly informal discussions with their pre-



ceptors. Dr. McCabe explained, also, the workings of the honor system at Princeton, the success of which he ascribed to the strong public opinion among the students, who stand ready to deal summarily with those who abuse it.

Mr. Gill spoke in the most optimistic terms of the University, and expressed his astonishment at its truly remarkable growth. The speaker declared himself to be firmly convinced that the Catholic University is destined to take rank as one of the world's greatest institutions of higher learning. Mr. Gill pointed out that there is a need for just such study of social and economic questions as the Lyceum is making. The student who takes advantage of the opportunity the society offers not only becomes equipped with a knowledge of the laws and principles upon which society is based, but has also the light of religion to guide him in his judgments. Men so favored should be a power for great good in their respective communities.

The Triangle and T-Square Club is one of the most industrious organizations of which the University can boast. This society was founded in 1912 by the students of the Architectural Department of the Catholic University, under the direction of Mr. Murphy, professor of that department. The purpose of the organization is to further the knowledge of architecture with a view towards the professional side as well as the artistic. The fine sociability of its members and their keen interest in the work form a strong bond which links the club together.

Besides the regular monthly meetings, a lecture upon an architectural or constructural subject is given every month, generally on an evening. The first lecture for the present school year took place down in the architectural offices of Mr. Murphy on the evening of October 15, 1913. Mr. White, of the Cassidy Construction Company, explained the system existing between architects and contractors. The second lecture was given in the new architectural rooms in Gibbons Hall on the evening of November 14, 1913. Mr. Gideon, of the National Fireproofing Company, discussed the rise and perfection of modern fireproof construction. Mr. Gideon also enlivened his talk with

witty remarks and funny stories. The Plumb Bob Society, the particular organization of the Civil Engineering Department, attended in full force.

**Lectures by Distinguished Visitors.** On November 10th, the Right Reverend Abbot Gasquet lectured to a large and interested audience in the Aula-Maxima of McMahon Hall on "The Revision of the Vulgate." On the afternoon of December 9th, Mr. Wilfrid Ward, Editor of the *Dublin Review*, gave an interesting lecture in McMahon Hall on "The Four Cardinals of the English Catholic Revival."

**The Temperance Movement in America.** The series of public lectures at the Catholic University of America was resumed January fifteenth, the lecturer, William H. DeLacy, D. C. L., treating of the Temperance Movement in America. The speaker graphically depicted the drinking customs of Colonial days, and rapidly sketched the growth of the temperance movement from those times until the visit to Congress last month of the Committee of One Thousand Men bearing a petition for the passage of a Prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The importance of the temperance problem to the Nation from a moral and physical, a social and economic standpoint, was dwelt upon. A description in detail was given of the individuals and organizations that had been foremost in the work in the United States. Especial emphasis was laid upon the important results flowing from the visit to America of Father Theobald Matthew, the Irish Apostle of Temperance, who was shown honor on all sides, the United States Senate voting him the then unusual honor of the privilege of the floor. To the influence of this visit the speaker traced the formation of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, with its distinct divisions for Men, Women, Juveniles, and Priests, the whole now forming a mighty phalanx over one hundred thousand strong, all working to free our country from the evils of intemperance.



# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*February, 1914.*

*No. 2.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore ; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit.*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

**J. E. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

Vol. XX.

February, 1914.

---

No. 2.

## INTELLECTUALISM IN PRACTICAL LIFE.

---

Whether or not we accept as adequate the time-honored definition of man as a "rational animal," that is, whether or not we admit that "rational" connotes sufficiently—at least in an implicit and fundamental way—all the essential characteristics that differentiate man from all other animals, it seems to become more and more widely recognized that "rational" expresses a distinctly and exclusively human prerogative. Not long ago there was a widespread tendency to interpret the behavior of animals after a human fashion, and to explain their activities by factors borrowed from the highest processes of human psychology—a sort of inverted anthromorphism, which, by the way, was used not unfrequently by those who, in another line of research, objected to the theistic position on the ground of its alleged anthropomorphism. These explanations started chiefly from the assumed necessity of showing that between man and animal the difference is one of degree only, not of kind, and that, since animals possess rudiments of the highest human faculties, the evolution of man from lower forms of life meets with no insuperable obstacle. But accurate experiments and scientific methods of investigation, free from *a priori* preoccupations, make it clearer and clearer that the mechanism of animal behavior, whatever be its nature, is not under the guidance of reason, and that, consequently, man alone is rational.

But it may be interesting to examine by reflection what actual

part reason plays in our ordinary life. By reason here is meant one of the functions of the intellect, that is, of the faculty of abstract, universal, and necessary knowledge, as opposed to the knowledge of concrete, individual, and contingent realities through the senses. Reason is the faculty by which one truth is logically inferred from other truths on which it depends; it is the faculty by which the logical links between various ideas are discovered and utilized. Its rules are the subject-matter of Logic, and hence the present paper might not improperly be entitled: *Logic in Practical Life*. It contains nothing new, and the excuse for publishing it is that we frequently lose sight of even the most obvious facts, especially when they refer to ourselves. Nor does it claim to be in any way complete and exhaustive; it only emphasizes certain facts and principles which must be kept in mind when studying concrete human psychology. The twofold aspect of practical life, namely belief and action, will be considered in order to see how far they depend on reason and obey the rules of logic. And we shall limit ourselves to ordinary, common, everyday life, leaving aside such activities as have for their exclusive purpose the search of truth.

\* \* \* \* \*

It might be suspected at the outset that a faculty which deals essentially with abstractions, with crystallized and dead formulas, will not always meet perfectly the exigencies of practical life, which consists essentially in the facing of concrete, complex, and ever changing situations, different from all other situations, by a concrete, complex, and ever changing individual, different from all other individuals. This, however, is what must be examined in the light of the facts.

That the mind is one is almost a psychological truism, yet it is not useless to insist on this principle, for it has been overlooked frequently, even by those who are fully aware of its theoretical truth, in the explanation of the actual working of the mind. The splitting of man, who is essentially one being, into several hypostasized faculties; the distinction of the faculties of knowledge from the faculties of feeling and action,

leading sometimes to the wrong supposition that they are independent of, and even antagonistic to, one another; the assumption that reason occupies a superior position as the absolute ruler and supreme judge of the other faculties, without being itself in any way subject to them—all this has been a frequent source of confusion and misunderstanding in psychological science. Analysis was a useful and necessary procedure, for our mind cannot understand at once the whole reality of so complex a being as man. But analysis has misled some to lose sight of the one central fact, that under these manifold manifestations man is one, and that sensation and reason, feeling and will, knowledge and action, science and practice, belong to the same undivided mind, and consequently work together. After analysing, one should not fail to reconstruct the real mind by synthesis, and should see that the process of distinction, good as it is as a method, cannot be transferred from the mental order of abstraction to the actual working of reality. One organ by itself, or even all the organs taken separately, are not the organism any more than a machine is the mere sum of its parts. The human mind is not an intelligence plus a will or plus an activity, but it is at once a feeling and willing and acting intelligence, or, if you prefer, an intelligent source of feeling and action. No mental faculty can be exercised normally without being influenced by all the others, and hence the act of intelligent cognition is ever under the influence of subjective dispositions as well as of objective evidence.

Besides the external reasons and motives which draw the mind to give or refuse its assent to a proposition, there is the all-important internal element which impels the mind to give or refuse such assent. While this is true to some extent of all assents, it is true especially of those that lead to practical consequences. In ordinary life, whether we will it or not, whether we know it or not, our beliefs are not guided by any pure reason or argument; they are sometimes not guided by reason at all. We find in the human mind a web of conventionalities, habits, dispositions, both innate and acquired, which the keenest analysis cannot disentangle. They may not be present in conscious-



ness, and often, notwithstanding all efforts to bring them to the surface, most of them remain hidden from the mind. They are active, nevertheless, and their influence is easily perceived in the analysis of our mode of action and behavior. Even if they primarily affect the feelings, will, or action, we know that "What ardently we wish we soon believe," and, to use Bacon's words, that "Men's thoughts are much according to their inclination; their discourse and speeches according to their learning and infused opinions; but their deeds are after as they have been accustomed." That man would be laboring under an illusion who would think that to him could never be applied the words of Henry IV: "Thy wish was father, Harry, to that thought." Who, knowing himself as he is and as others perhaps know him, can boast that he never saw things as he wished them to be?

The majority of our social, political, moral, religious, and other practical assents are based on merely implicit inferences which have their foundation partly perhaps in reason, but also to a great extent in affective and actual life. Reason may approve and ratify them later on, but they are accepted before being reasoned out. In mathematics permanent assents are obtained by exact demonstration, but this is never the case in the affairs of practical life. These have an importance for the whole man, not only for his reason, and the whole man must be convinced. Experience shows abundantly the truth of the saying:

He that complies against his will  
Is of his own opinion still.

Does the candidate for election prove the justice of his cause by accurate logic? Which succeeds better, the orator who uses valid but cold arguments, or the one who, though perhaps lacking in logic, knows how to appeal to the feelings and prejudices of his hearers? In many cases, and with many people, if you do not want to settle a question, argue logically about it. A pure syllogism, however cogent, will not produce a permanent assent if the other faculties are not at one with the intellect. When a man cherishes some belief, syllogistic controversy is

not likely to convince him of anything except that he is right. When the mind is not prepared to receive a truth, the intellect, though convinced, is sure to retreat soon before the combined attacks of wish, will, inclination, and affections, except perhaps in extreme cases of almost exclusively intellectual types of mind, who disregard and disdain the contingent affairs of this world, and as a consequence prove themselves unfit for the practical things of life. In fact, the disposition to deal with abstractions is generally accompanied by the incapacity to meet the concrete demands of everyday affairs.

Frequently belief exists before the reasons to believe are known. We assent to the conclusion without passing through the premises, and it is only later that we discover reasons to justify our already existing belief—reasons whose value is estimated largely according to subjective dispositions. In many cases, reasons are used not so much to test and rectify existing beliefs as to give them that apparent justification and logical reasonableness which the mind requires. The first step is: this proposition is true; the second: how shall I prove it? And when we have proved a thing to our own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of sympathetic hearers we may be under the illusion that the thing is proved in itself, forgetting that we have seen through magnifying glasses reasons which others may examine through the reducing lenses of their different mental dispositions, and that we have overlooked or minimized the value of objections which others will thoroughly consider and perhaps exaggerate. In practical matters we think as we are, and we are what we are owing to manifold influences, and chiefly to mental surroundings, and to education begun in the family, continued in the school, and pursued throughout life. It is impossible to empty the mind of its previously acquired contents—contents not always acquired rationally—and it is just as impossible not to appreciate new truths according to these preconceived ideas.

A typical, even if extreme, instance of the manner in which many judgments are formed is found in the great English architect, Augustus Welby Pugin, the founder of the Gothic revival. I quote from Wilfrid Ward's *Life and Times of Cardinal Wise-*

*man*: "He [Pugin] visited 'Sant' Andrea delle Fratte,' the scene of the miraculous conversion of Abbé Ratisbonne, the Jew. Abbé Ratisbonne entered the church a Jew, and came out a Christian, having seen there, he stated, a vision of our Lady. 'The story,' Pugin said, after seeing the church, 'is demonstrably false. The man *could* not have said a prayer in such a hideous church. Our Lady *could* not have chosen such a church for a vision. The man could have had no piety in him to have stayed in such a church at all.' The friend to whom his remarks were addressed replied: 'As I heard the story, Ratisbonne was not at the moment praying, but thinking of the uncouthness of the architecture of the place.' Pugin's whole face changed: 'Is that so? Then he was a man of God. He knew what true Christianity was, though he was a Jew. I honour him. Our Lady would have come to him *anywhere*. The story is demonstrably true."

All men do the same in varying degrees. Theories are accepted, and then facts are found or selected in order to prove these theories, or at least to fit in with them. If such facts are not to be found, a little artificial modification of those at hand may adapt them sufficiently for the purpose. If finally this adaptation is impossible, well—so much the worse for the facts; they are partially discredited or entirely ignored. Facts have the reputation of being "stubborn things," yet, in some hands, and when used for certain purposes, they seem to become most docile and pliable. Again the influence even of words and formulas should not be overlooked. Hobbes has very aptly said that "Words are wise men's counters: they do but reckon by them; but they are the money of fools." And who can claim truthfully that he has never been a "fool" in this respect, and that he has never been deceived by words? Change the contents and leave the label, and all is well; but change the label without touching the contents, and a mental revolt followed by a vehement protest is the outcome.

Our sympathy or antipathy for men and things cannot fail to modify our views, and naturally our fundamental sympathy is for ourselves. We give others news, they give us gossip; we en-

tertain them, they bore us; we speak, they talk; we play the violin, they can fiddle a little; we are active, they are never at rest; we have some faults, they have some qualities; we are strict, they are harsh; we are indulgent, they are weak; and so on all along the line. This natural antagonism between the ego and other persons influences the views which we have of those who are or are not in sympathy with ourselves. Take two men who are as closely alike in character, qualities and defects, as possible. One is a friend of ours and happens to make a mistake. We think and say: Of course no man is perfect; it is impossible to avoid every fault; the best have some defects, etc. For the other we have no sympathy; on the contrary we regard him with almost positive dislike. He performs a noble deed, and we immediately say: No man is without some good features; even the worst at times do some good, etc. Both statements imply a mixture of good and bad characteristics, but the proportion of each varies considerably according to the expression used.

In general then we must admit that, while the influence of reason cannot be denied, and while some are by nature more intellectual and therefore more strictly logical than others, it remains true that other influences are constantly at work in shaping our assents and dissents, in determining what we shall hold true, and what false. Whatever it may be for epistemology or ontology, truth, for the psychology of practical life, is no absolute thing; it is relative to a number of circumstances, mental, physiological, and even physical, which by modifying the mind cannot fail to influence the judgment.

\* \* \* \* \*

Such being the case, how can we expect men to be consistent in their actions and behavior? A difference in practical knowledge will always make a difference in conduct. Practical active life consists in a series of reactions to concrete situations that confront an individual and require a special response on his part. As no two situations are perfectly identical in every respect, and as the human mind is being constantly modified in consequence of its accumulated experience, one may see at once

how great a diversity of responses is possible, not only in different individuals, but even in the same person at different times. To believe that activities can follow one another in perfectly logical sequence is to take a superficial view of men and things, and to mistake as identical realities which are in truth widely different.

It is impossible not to look at things from our own personal point of view. Subjective dispositions are varied and changing, and thus we become interested in different things. On the other hand, things themselves are very complex, and present many aspects any one of which may become interesting for a given onlooker. Hence it follows that responses to concrete environment are capable of infinite variations. True, there are rational principles to guide human action in all fields of business, morality, religion, etc. True, also, in the most important events we take time to deliberate, think, reflect on what is the best course to be followed. But here we are concerned with everyday actions, and not with the critical decisions that are taken in exceptional cases. We are guided by intellectual principles, we say, but are such principles in reality always used as guides and tests? Are they not sometimes rather used as proofs that our course of action was the right one? We act first, and then by the selecting of convenient principles, and the careful avoiding of inconvenient ones, we try to convince ourselves and others that the action was all that it should have been. Moreover, are such principles exclusively rational? Has their truth always been ascertained by the one who uses them? Are they not rather many a time framed for the need of the hour? Add to this that the application of such abstract principles may be made in a number of ways. To the solution of a practical problem not one only, but several principles may be applied according to the point of view from which things are considered. The principles of wisdom, duty, expediency, utility, pleasure, etc., may conflict with one another, and yet we have to choose one, and act accordingly. It is clear that reason alone does not determine which must prevail; the whole mental disposition also has its share in the decision.

Principles are subordinated in many ways, and it is not always an easy matter in a concrete case to establish the order of subordination or precedence. Even when we deliberate most earnestly in order to find the solution, the deliberation is guided not only by reason, but by habitual and transitory mental dispositions, endowed with a tendency to bring a certain principle to the surface and give it preference over the others. We are selective because we are not simply looking for the truth, or because the truth is such that we cannot look for it in a disinterested way. Because his object is the finding of truth, the scientist has to observe all cases with their circumstances. The chemist, for instance, cannot eliminate from his laboratory combinations that may be offensive to his sense of smell, nor can the historian overlook deeds of murder or rapine. In practical life, however, we do leave aside such facts or principles as would lead to unwelcome consequences.

What has just been said applies to actions that are under the immediate guidance of reflection. But these are few when compared to the number of actions that are not preceded by any thought or deliberation, either, as sometimes happens, because it is urgent to take a determination at once, to give an immediate answer, to adopt without delay a course of action, or, as is the case more frequently, because actions have become habitual and take place automatically. Here the influence of reason is considerably lessened.

The great majority of daily actions are performed through habit and routine. In the beginning they required a number of distinct efforts, but now the whole coördinated series unwinds itself uniformly and without attention. We may have a more or less distinct consciousness of such activities, but they proceed of themselves unless inhibited by a positive act of the will. The influence of reason on habitual actions is antecedent, not actual; remote, not immediate; that is, this influence is to be found at the start, before the action had become habitual, and it exists in the same proportion in which reason was instrumental in creating the mechanisms which now act automatically. What this

proportion is cannot be determined, for here again the complexity of the human mind, the influence of environment and of inherited and acquired dispositions, the fact that the acquisition of many habits begins even before the child possesses the use of reason, make it impossible to assign to every factor its relative importance. It is habit more than reason that produces uniformity of action, and is the greatest source of consistency in human life.

The dispositions and whims of the mind defy the most earnest attempt at analysis. An indigestion, a "blue" feeling, an illness, bad weather, and so on indefinitely, change, temporarily perhaps, but markedly, a man's disposition, and hence cannot but modify his various reactions to environment. It is largely because of this that in circumstances in which an individual would be expected to follow the same line of conduct, he will behave in a different manner. Perhaps he will reproach himself or be reproached by others for his inconsistency and lack of logic, consistency being looked upon as the standard to be reached. The different apprehension of the concrete situation, or the different application of the principles that govern it, which cause the apparent inconsistency in conduct, cannot be avoided entirely, since these causes are based on the nature itself of the human mind.

In practical matters the same proposition cannot have exactly the same meaning for all those who accept it, for it cannot be viewed from exactly the same angle, and with all the same implications. How could it have exactly the same meaning for those who accept it and for those who reject it? And how could there be any hope of escaping the diversity of subsequent action? Practical life in all its phases consists of concrete doings in response to concrete demands, hence it is not to be expected that it will always follow the abstract rules of logic.

\* \* \* \* \*

Complexity on the part of concrete reality which may be considered from an infinity of points of view; complexity on the part of the living mind which passes from process to process,

from disposition to disposition, and which is modified more or less deeply and permanently at every step: such are the reasons why it is not possible to reach perfect consistency in knowledge and action. The starting point varies with individuals; and, as even from the same starting point it is possible to have roads leading in every direction, so it is unreasonable to expect that all lives will have the same orientation, and, when they happen to have the same general orientation, that they will agree in all details. Many will start with different principles, and even where common principles are used, their interpretations and applications will be as many as the individuals who use them. The concrete facts of life are not always practically amenable to the precepts of pure reason, and the practical logic of one man cannot be estimated by the standard of another man's reasoning.

Undoubtedly we must strive to be logical, and teach others to be so; we must start from principles known to be certain, and carry them out as far and as faithfully as possible: this is the goal at which we should aim. The purpose of the present paper was not to discountenance this ideal, but only to indicate why it is not and cannot be realized in its fullness, and, by calling attention to the obstacles to be encountered, to make it easier to overcome them. But, even with the best intention and effort, there is no possibility of ever being perfectly consistent, for we cannot escape the influence of education, surroundings, and consequent prejudices. To live an exclusively rational life, were such a mental mutilation possible, would be to renounce some of the most important human faculties, and to maim our own nature. And since human nature essentially has other than rational faculties, to believe that the intellect can be isolated from these other faculties, so that it will not be permeated by their influence, shows a lack of knowledge of the actual working of the human mind.

As only those who are aware of the presence of disturbing influences can guard against them, it follows that such as plume themselves on their consistency and logic to the end are generally those who are less widely influenced by objective evidence, and more strongly swayed by subjective dispositions, whose



presence they do not even suspect. Man is rational, but reason applied to the facts of life has ways that are not always those of dead logic, and it shares in the protean diversity of the human mind and of external reality. Perhaps the fact that this is so is not to be deplored. Should every man become perfectly logical, this world would become monotonous, dull, and tedious, by losing the diversity of belief and action which, even if it is at times a source of painful experiences, constitutes nevertheless one of its most fascinating charms.

C. A. DUBRAY.

## LUTHER IN THE LIGHT OF FACTS.

---

Out of the maze of legend and controversy that for almost four centuries has obscured a sane view of Luther, at last there begins to emerge a fairly correct portrait of this extraordinary historic personality. Luther's own contemporaries were amazingly ignorant of the character of the man whom, according to their religious pre-judgment, they either execrated or canonized. Needless to say that the succeeding religious differences still further prevented a fair account of him. But for the past fifteen or twenty years steady progress has been made toward an adequate biography. On the non-Catholic side appeared such valuable biographies as that by Köstlein, edited by Kawerau in 1903. On the Catholic side Janssen and Denifle have likewise accomplished wonders. The latest, which can be justly termed about the best single book on Luther, is that by Herman Grisar, S. J.—"Luther." English translation by E. M. Lamond, B. Herder, 1913—the two first volumes so far the only ones translated.

This book is not for the popular reader. But it should be read by anyone who wishes to at least get at a reasonable view of Luther. Its great merit lies in that it is documentary, making Luther as it were tell his own story by copious quotations from his voluminous writings. Add to this an eminent fairness of spirit and temperateness in style truly refreshing in a work dealing with such a delicate subject. All readers, Catholic as well as Protestant, will find after reading it that they must seriously reconstruct their views of this extraordinary personality. On the one hand, Catholics must abandon (if they had them) whatever beliefs they may have entertained as to any really serious moral shortcomings in Luther's character before his apostasy and marriage. He was evidently just about as morally clean as the average cleric of his day, though it is true that considerable talk went the rounds about his conduct with

Catherine von Bora previous to their marriage, also some severe criticism of his bibulous habits, and above all of his undeniably shocking coarseness in polemical writing. On the other hand, one can only look with a pitying smile upon those Protestants who will still strive to enshroud him with the halo of sainthood or of even, to modern standards, ordinary love of truth.

\* \* \* \* \*

The one great fact that stands out in sharp relief is that the genesis of Luther's apostacy had absolutely nothing to do with reform, a disgust with ecclesiastical abuses. All this came later, when Luther was older and became more and more confused in his own accounts of his youth. True, even in the beginning, he did scourge abuses just as did every Catholic preacher of the day, and as time went on more and more did he make use of these abuses to further his cause. But it is overwhelmingly evident from this biography that, abuses or no abuses, Luther by sheer mental development would have acted precisely as he did. Long before his attack on Indulgences or any other abuses, Luther had developed his heresy, his doctrine of justification by faith alone. From the earliest beginnings he seemed to have been simply beset with this idea. The explanation seems most likely to be along psychological lines. That is, he was steadily pushed to this view not by abuses he saw around him, about which at first he seemingly cared little, but by the peculiar bent of his nature. Naturally despondent, given to actual hallucinations of attacks by devils, oppressed by a horror of damnation, nervous and frequently broken in health, he seemed as if he had, for peace's sake, to discover some doctrine that would "assure" him of forgiveness and salvation. Hence, discarding all intermediaries, with true Teutonic roughness, he simply cast himself in despair upon the crucified Christ, and laid all his sins and burdens upon His atonement. Luther, therefore, was first and foremost and in the beginning a "heretic" and not a "reformer." In this he differed nothing from Arius, Nestorius, Pelagius and all the others. Note this, "Reform" was *not* in any sense of the term the motive force of Luther. It was the idea of "justification by faith alone." Let us remark also, in

passing, that the work was well under way long before the attack on indulgences by his theses nailed on the church door at Wittenberg. Aside from the fact that the nailing of theses was a customary academic act of those days, the act itself was not much more than an incident in the general drama. Only later on was it invested with the romance it now possesses in the imagination of his popular admirers.

Another broad fact stands out in this account. It is that Luther's insistence upon the Scriptures had not so much the end of placing them in the hands of the people, as is so commonly understood, as of making the Scriptures the sole rule of faith. It was not a question of actually possessing the Bible as of how to regard it. That ancient fable of Luther "discovering!" the Bible as a sort of long-forgotten dust-covered manuscript is too silly even to deny. Luther, as well as every other man of education of his day, was accustomed to the scriptures from his youth. By the very rule of his order he was obliged to study them diligently. Like thousands of others in any other schools, he was a regularly appointed professor of scripture. It was precisely this position as teacher of scripture in his monastery that gave the outlet to his peculiar views. Had the Bible been as unknown as the popular biography supposes, Luther might not have developed as he did along scriptural lines. Here again Luther's maturer memory played him tricks. He fell back for excuses upon the supposed lack of scriptures just as he did upon the presence of abuses, when, as a matter of fact, there is no evidence from his own earlier works to prove that these things exercised any material effect upon his early mental development.

Again, even the most pronounced Protestant must admit that, however great Luther may be as an historical personality, his actual mentality was certainly not extraordinary, and cannot be put in the same class with that of the previous great heretics, such as Nestorius, Arius, Photius or Pelagius, with all due respect to his ability as a translator and popular preacher. He simply had that one besetting notion of justification by faith alone and dinned it into people's heads until by sheer attrition it

wore its way in. Though clever enough in abuse and twisting of scriptural texts, his attempts to give a reasonable basis for his position were puerile. We see none of the keen analytical power or the metaphysical grasp of former great heretics: rather only the rushing, torrential power of Teutonism that by sheer bulk and noise won its way to the rabble, brutally thrusting aside reason, no less than tradition and custom.

From his own writings he shows himself woefully lacking in the equipment which his very character as a leader of thought demanded. On reading his polemical writings one is forced to either of the following conclusions: Either he deliberately falsified the teaching of the Fathers, the scholastics and the official utterances of the Church authorities, or else he was amazingly ignorant of them. Take Augustine, for instance, the one doctor to whose writings he most frequently appealed for support in his peculiar theory of grace. He audaciously tampered with the text of this great doctor in order to twist it to his meaning or else makes erroneous citations, so much so that even Luther's apologists and friends, such as Melancthon, admit that he quoted Augustine when Augustine did not agree with him and that Augustine downright contradicted Luther on most vital points. (Grisar, Vol. I, p. 305-6). The great scholastics, notably St. Thomas, fared likewise. In 1519 Luther boasted, "No one shall teach me scholastic theology; I know it." Yet, if the reader will consult the pages of Grisar (Vol. I, pp. 133 *et seq.*) he will see for himself that Luther had only the merest superficial acquaintance with scholasticism and attributed to these "sow theologians," as he so coarsely termed them, opinions which were in reality the opposite of what they actually held. Later on, when the fight was at its thickest, he seemed to absolutely throw truth to the winds in his downright misrepresentations and distortions of both historical truth and Catholic doctrine (Grisar, Vol. II, pp. 392-3).

Now, how are we to account for this. That much was due to anger and some to a perverted belief in the axiom that the end justifies the means (which we will touch upon later) is evident. But to our present purpose it is sufficient to show that

Luther was woefully deficient in theological equipment. Nor is this surprising when we take into account the comparatively low standard of theological culture in his day. The golden age of scholasticism had set and been succeeded by a more or less bastard kind fairly well impregnated with verbose logic-chopping and Occamist errors. The course of training was itself hurried as well as superficial. Luther, for instance, after entering Tübingen in 1497 as a Master of Arts, commenced, October 29th, 1498, the Biblical course, and only two months later (Jan. 1499) began to deliver theological lectures on the Sentences. After six months he took his Doctorate in Divinity. Such was the theological training of Luther—not more than a fraction of that received now by the average theological student, let alone a D. D. (Grisar, Vol. I, p. 129). And yet this man set himself against all the theologians past, present and to come. The conviction is irresistibly forced upon us that Luther was not as a theologian more than superficially equipped to grapple with religious questions. Nor can it be said that later studies made up the deficiency. Because he was ever afterwards too busy for study. His labors as Prior in his order, his ceaseless output of polemical, devotional and scriptural works when the struggle commenced precluded serious study. True! his industry and capacity for work were herculean. But there was no time for reflection and no evidence of it. In the light of all this then it was nothing more or less than impudence on Luther's part to hurl the charge of ignorance against the "sow theologians," i. e., St. Thomas above all, whom he hated with an almost personal hate. These men were infinitely his mental superiors. As for his apologists who caught up the cry and repeated it down the centuries to our own day, we can only hear them with a feeling mixed with pity and sadness at *their* ignorance.

\* \* \* \* \*

Luther, as the father of Protestantism, has been hailed by his admirers as the pioneer who blazed the way for modern progress; the hero who broke the religious, mental and political shackles forged by the Papacy for enslaved mankind; the cham-

pion of the rights of reason against an arrogant hierarchy; the liberator of the human intellect, and so forth. How much are these praises founded in cold fact?

Right in the beginning it can be stated, by way of general denial that the very cardinal principle of his religious system was debasing to humanity as such. That cardinal principle was the doctrine of the utter corruption of human nature due to original sin, and the consequent denial of free will. "Articulus omnium optimus et rerum nostrarum summa" in his own words. Along with these doctrines likewise went that other of Predestination. Man, according to him, was utterly incapable of doing good without supernatural grace: man has no freedom of choice even in the performance of works not connected with salvation. It is either God or the Devil that rules him. If God sees fit to damn him, then God forces him to do evil in spite of himself: he *must* sin. Earlier Protestant historians have sought to avoid this side of Luther's teaching, but later biographers now all sorrowfully admit it.

Now with such a dismal and low estimate of human nature can Luther be legitimately regarded as in any sense an apostle of humanity, of human liberty, of human dignity or inherent worth? Pushed to its logical conclusion such a doctrine would debase man below the most devil-ridden superstitious savage. What becomes of human dignity or intrinsic natural nobility and daring and Promethean struggle upwards, of human development and progress, of aspirations for liberty, for light, for anything that mankind has ever attained in his age-long painful struggle from barbarism to civilization, if he were as Luther would have him—a hopelessly corrupt being, devoid of spiritual liberty as a mere animal, utterly incapable of himself of doing good, the mere sport of either a devil that mocks him or of a God that damns him without mercy, a plaything in the hands of fate, an automaton? Such doctrine *ipso facto* kills every aspiration of humanity. It halts human progress more effectually than Confucianism. It would paralyze every noble aspiration and stop every wheel of progress. Is it not, therefore, more correct to say that humanity has progressed since Luther's day in *spite of Lutheranism*?

But more specifically as to Luther's claim to be an apostle of progress. Take for instance his views upon reason. The human will had, as we have seen, been utterly denied all power, practically annihilated. Human reason fared almost as bad. In fact, his contempt for human reason sprang from the difficulties involved in a denial of free will. For, if we deny free will, then so much seems contradictory and mysterious to our reason. Then so much the better Luther says. "Reason speaks nothing but madness and foolishness, especially concerning holy things" (Grisar, Vol. II, 279). In arguing for infant baptism against the Anabaptists he justifies it on the ground that after all reason is not essential to faith, in fact, is hostile to faith (373). Such being the case, in what possible sense can Luther be claimed as a friend of reason, as a worshipper at reason's shrine, as defender of the rights of reason, as the hero breaking reason's bonds and freeing it from ecclesiastical tyranny? In what sense can Lutheranism be termed "reasonable?" Verily if ever man preached contempt for reason, disregarded its inherent rights, lowered it in the esteem of mankind, that man was Martin Luther. If reason has since then developed and conquered so much of nature and become so supreme as it today, it has done so in spite of Luther's doctrine. His doctrine would logically put an end to all philosophy, to all science. Mental progress were impossible were his doctrine to prevail. Herbert Spencer would come in for his condemnation no less than did actually Aristotle.

To many this will seem quite strange in view of that other popular tradition that Lutheranism and Humanism were twin births or at least indissoluble friends. A passing word as to this. Now there were two and only two things in common between Luther and the Humanists at first: both favored the study of the classic languages, one for their classic beauty, the other as aids to the translation of the scriptures; both at first were critical of the existing ecclesiastical conditions, the one in a more or less spirit of satire, the other out of mortal hatred. There the friendliness ceased. As a matter of fact, they drew further and further away as time went on, until Humanism at last found its most



congenial and well-nigh only home precisely in those Catholic countries where it was first born. Erasmus, the greatest of all the Humanists, summed it all up in his own life. At first he played with Lutheranism out of mere hatred of scholasticism (such as he ignorantly fancied it), then he became its most formidable opponent and laments that "Wherever Lutheranism reigns there learning dies" (Grisar, Vol. II, p. 256). Luther, in like manner, welcomed at first Humanism as an ally, but later on vented his anger against it just as he had done against scholasticism (Vol. II, p. 398). The truth of the matter was that there was a chasm between the two. One was a glorification of humanity, the other a debasement of humanity. No wonder then that most of the Humanists forsook Lutheran lands to find shelter in lands faithful to Catholicity, which, whilst frowning upon the vagaries of Humanism, could nevertheless encourage its genuine love of culture. Then again Humanism, and that means the "culture" of all that and succeeding periods, lived on in spite of Luther and because of the protection of that very Catholicity which it had in its youthful excess turned away from for awhile, but not for long. Human reason in the long run found shelter in the old Church.

\* \* \* \* \*

We now come to perhaps the most formidable claim of Luther upon modern sympathy, namely, his influence as an apostle of freedom of conscience, political liberty (democracy) and separation of Church and State. As a premise to the following we say, like St. Thomas, "*dicendum quod non.*" By no means. Hopeless partisan is he who can find in Luther's own writings as given profusely in the book before us any sympathy whatever on his part with any of these modern tenets, these bulwarks of modern civilization.

First as to freedom of conscience, religious liberty, toleration, etc. That these words were familiar enough on Luther's lips is true. But it was liberty and toleration for himself and his followers, none others. At Erfurt, Nurmberg, Wittenberg, wherever his party got the ascendant, it was invariable persecution and prohibition of both Catholic and dissident Protestants,

all defended by Luther. For an instance: He seeks to induce the Elector, his patron, to abolish all other faiths except his own at Attenberg, saying "Let there be but one doctrine in every place." This is only one of countless instances. He even advocated the infliction of the death penalty upon those differing from himself, justifying his attitude by quotations from the Old Testament. So he spoke regarding the Anabaptists (Grisar, Vol. II, p. 369). In fact, Luther's intolerance was so consistent that no serious historian would waste time in looking for aught to the contrary, in his writings. So then, how can Luther be called a friend of religious liberty, an apostle of freedom of conscience. No! It is childish to expect such modern views from a man of his age, above all from a man of his fiery temperament. Religious toleration came not until centuries after Luther, and then as a result of sheer weariness on the part of the conflicting religious parties. It was accepted as a practical *modus vivendi* necessitated by the impossibility of either conquering the other. Only in our time has this practical solution been elevated to the dignity of a theoretical principle. No one—Catholic or Protestant—believed in religious freedom or even toleration in that age of religious strife, and least of all Luther. Let that myth rest in peace.

If Luther, however intolerant, can be justified for his intolerance by the spirit of his age, it is harder to see in him a friend of the "people," a defender of popular civil liberty. For this let the reader turn to the account (p. 189-219) of the Peasant War of 1525, an affair which must forever remain as a black stain upon the pages of Luther's life. Until recently a quite lame attempt has been made by his biographers to absolve Luther's responsibility for this awful uprising on the ground of its having been a social affair. Now, however, they are being compelled to admit that even though social, it was fanned into flame and nourished by the preaching of the reformers, Luther directly. Germany then was in a fever of social discontent with the masses arrayed against the princes. Luther's preaching of religious freedom from the ancient spiritual control fell like matches upon powder upon the ears of the discontented. As a

result a perfect war of anarchy burst forth in 1525, which for a time threw parts of Germany into social chaos, until the uprising was put down in most merciless and bloody fashion. Now, how did Luther conduct himself? Whilst at first posing as the friend of the oppressed and boldly upbraiding the Princes for their oppressions, all the time fanning the people into rebellion with his fiery addresses, no sooner did he see that success was to rest with the Princes, but he turns over to their party and leaves the poor peasant to the mercy of their conquerors, whom he urges on to what would now be called fiendish cruelty. "Pure deviltry," he says, "is urging on the peasants"; they "rob and rage and behave like mad dogs. Therefore, let all, who are able, hew them down, slaughter and stab them, openly or in secret, and remember that there is nothing more poisonous, noxious and utterly devilish than a rebel. You must kill him as you would a mad dog. \* \* \* Let whoever is able help in the slaughter," and so on. Such was the short shrift Luther accorded the very men who were only following out his own preaching. It is a pretty foul blot on his character.

Nor can it be urged in reply that Luther was not here enunciating his general views on the relations between authorities and subjects, because these above words fall in only too aptly with what he wrote on other occasions when he was speaking in general. Listen to the following from this heralded prophet of democracy. In one of his sermons printed in 1526, he says:

"Because God has given a law and knows that no one keeps it, He has appointed lictors, drivers and overseers, for Scripture speaks thus of authorities in a Parable: Like the donkey-drivers who have to lie on the necks of their beasts and whip them to make them go. In the same way the authorities must drive, beat and slay the people, Messrs. Omnes, hang, burn, behead and break them on the wheel, that they may be kept in awe. \* \* \* As the swine and wild beasts have to be driven and constrained by force, so the authorities must insist upon keeping of the laws." Luther even goes so far as to assert that the best thing that could come about would be the revival of serfdom and slavery. Later on he depicted the peasants as follows: "A

peasant is a hog, for when a hog is slaughtered it is dead, and in the same way the peasant does not think about the next life, for otherwise he would behave quite differently. \* \* \* The peasant remains a boor, do what you will; they have their mouth, nose, eyes and everything else in the wrong place. I believe that the devil does not mind the peasants." \* \* \* "He despises then as he does leaden pennies: he easily manages to secure them for himself, as they will be claimed by no one else." "A peasant who is a Christian is like a wooden poker," and so forth. Truly this is a long call from the Declaration of Independence and Rousseau and the Bill of Rights. It is hard indeed to see in the heart of the author of such contemptuous references to the "people" the slightest intimation of any sentiment approaching democracy or even ordinary civil liberty. Such words could come only from a firm believer in class rule and the most undisguised monarchical tyranny. It, therefore, passes the imagination and the most kindly spirit of criticism to see in Luther any sympathy whatever for democratic institutions, for civil freedom, any love for the masses or the "people" (Grisar, Vol. II, pp. 217-218).

And this brings us to a consideration of Luther's opinions concerning the relations between Church and State. For this the historian must consult his acts rather than his words. His utterances on that all-important subject are too confused and contradictory to admit of any definite conclusion. According to the variation of circumstances he expressed varying opinions. No central principles seemed to have guided him (Grisar, Vol. II, p. 312). But when we come to his actions, then we do find an unvarying consistency in advocating the duty and right of the authorities to regulate religious observance in their domains, with the equally unvarying proviso that they establish Lutheranism. Wherever the new opinions flourished, it did so always with connivance or open protection of the civil authorities, who were only too willing to assist in view of the material advantages to them resulting from the exploitation of church property. This is, of course, merely elementary history. In his "Erastianism" Luther was, of course, not ahead of his age. Separation of

Church and State was unthought of and, with the exception of a few idealists like Thomas More, unthinkable in those days. Protestant and Catholic alike believed uniformly in a close alliance.

It is, therefore, quite silly and childish for a modern admirer of Luther to seek to see in him any thing whatsoever that could make of him a fore-runner of our so widely accepted theory of separation between the civil and religious powers. Such a view is not history: it is imagination impinged back upon a past age utterly different in temper from our own. One could as well see in Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans a foreshadowing of the latest advance in surgery.

\* \* \* \* \*

There are one or two other aside considerations which deserve attention before closing this survey of Luther's character, since they throw light upon some stock-in-trade charges against the church of his day.

First, concerning that ancient calumny directed chiefly against the Jesuits, that a pretty general principle of theirs was that "the end justifies the means."

Now, even a superficial knowledge of that most unlovable period of history is enough to show that it was, comparatively, a rather unscrupulous one, which did not hesitate to stoop to some rather shady means to attain its ends. We know of no period of history which seems so essentially dishonest and cynical as that extending, roughly speaking, all through the three centuries following upon Luther's appearance. The politics of that time are a maze of deceit, wherein Elizabeth, Frederick, Philip, Richelieu, Peter the Great, Henry VIII, all played about as dirty, shameless, cynical game as ever disgraced human annals. For our separated brethren then to attempt to fix all the odium upon Catholics of the time is about equal to the pot calling the kettle black, leaving aside the utterly unproved and unprovable slander that Jesuits or any other Catholics ever held to such an infamous principle as the one in question.

Here again Luther was not ahead of his age. Whether from eagerness or forgetfulness of a high honor in the heat of the

struggle or from fear or from constitutional obliqueness of character or from a mixture of all, Luther did most undeniably make use of means to attain his ends which would now be considered by all right-minded persons as absolutely dishonest. He deliberately misled the people in introducing his teachings and did so knowingly and professedly. For, in order that his teachings might the better make progress, he advised his preachers to go slowly, *i. e.*, to retain most of the old Catholic customs to which the people were attached, and a sudden removal of which might anger them; in a word, to deceive the people into gradually becoming Lutherans whilst still thinking themselves true to the old Church.

"Thank God, in indifferent matters our churches are so arranged that a layman, whether Italian or Spaniard, unable to understand our preaching, seeing our Mass, choir, organ, bells, chantries, etc., would surely say that it was a regular papist church and that there was no difference or very little between it and his own" (Grisar, Vol. II, p. 322). For this reason also he retained in some places Communion in one kind, and that not of the chalice; also vestments, lights, etc. And all this done for the expressed and admitted purpose of fooling the people. Nor was this done as a mere exception. It was a settled policy wherever the change could not be made more rudely. Strange, too, for a man like Luther to advise people (as he did a young student) to attend that very Mass for which he said he had such a horror that he had sinned more when saying Mass in his earlier days than if he had "been a highwayman or had kept a brothel" (*Ib.* 323). With all this falls in Luther's brazen defense of lying apropos of his permitting Philip of Hesse to take a second wife, the first being still alive. He says, "What harm would there be, if a man, to accomplish better things and for the sake of the Christian Church, does tell a good, thumping lie?" Again, "We are convinced that the Papacy is the seat of the real and actual Antichrist, and believe that against its deceit and iniquity everything is permitted for the salvation of souls" (Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 456: Vol. IX).

Surely with these incontestable facts before their eyes Luth-

er's modern admirers would do well to be silent about "the end justifying the means." For in Luther's own words and acts and in those of his followers acting under his advice we find accepted as a settled and praiseworthy policy this, namely, to tolerate for the time being, in order to better deceive the people, Catholic practices which Luther regarded as abominations and blasphemies. If this is not justifying lying and deceit for a good end, then words mean nothing.

An allied and more serious question remains also to be dealt with, namely, how did Luther look upon assassination and the use of torture as means to the attainment of his ends? It would not be broached here at all except for the fact that these charges have been so widely levelled at Luther's Catholic contemporaries. So that even to this late day the mass of Protestants seem fairly well imbued with the conviction that assassination and torture were an exclusive prerogative of Luther's enemies.

Here, also, as everywhere when treating of Luther, it is only fair to Luther himself to be mindful of the character of the times wherein he lived. And Luther's times were surely bloody. Human life was cheap indeed then, and for a long time to come, when a Tudor king could snuff the life out of his queens without a very great shock to public opinion and when the awful Thirty Years War made of prosperous Germany one huge sepulchre. Men in those days hated to the death. There was none of that sentimental pity for the criminal characteristic of our times. They played high, and woe to the unlucky loser. So it came about that torture was an established method of criminal procedure, whether under an Elizabeth or Torquemada, and that human life was only too often taken by the shorter method of assassination.

No one, then, need be surprised to find that many of both sides shaved pretty close to advocating the latter. Even as comparatively gentle a man as Melancthon said that it was lawful to put a tyrant to death, and went so far as to express the hope that a man be found brave enough to kill Henry VIII of England. (*Catholic Church and Christian State*. Hergenröther, Essay xiv, 9.) To look for milder sentiments in a

man of Luther's ardent temperament is, of course, futile. We find him fully abreast of his times in the matter. Let the reader turn again to the history of the ill-fated peasant uprising, which must ever remain such a dark stain upon his career. After the leader, the prophet Munzer, had been defeated at the battle of Frankenhausen in 1525 and been tortured before execution, both Luther and Melancthon expressed their opinion that his torture should have been more severe (Grisar, Vol. II, p. 203). No more mercy did Luther show for Munzer's deluded followers, upon whom he invoked the most cruel measures from the hands of the victorious Princes, urging everybody to "hew them down, slaughter and stab them, openly or *in secret*." (*Ib.* 201.) The italics are our own. Mind that, "*every one*," who can, is thus urged to kill, and do it *in secret* as well as openly. Could a more explicit approval or a more open invitation to assassination be found? If a monarch like Philip II, putting the public ban upon a Protestant, acting in his capacity as sovereign punishing a criminal, be held accountable for murder, how much so should public opinion condemn Luther, who, though a private individual and a minister of God, took upon himself to advise "*every one*" to murder *in secret* those wretched peasants, who, after all, were only following out to the letter his own inflammatory denunciations of public authorities. His counsel was plainly and indefensibly a counsel of assassination. His admirers would, therefore, do well to go a bit slow in striving to fasten the odium of that detestable crime exclusively upon some Catholic rulers. It is, of course, evident that Luther was here merely reflecting the brutality of his age. Not even his bitterest opponent should accuse him or any of his Catholic contemporaries of holding to a theoretical belief in the right of assassination. The point, however, is that his Catholic contemporaries have the right to be judged by the same standard of practical morality of the day as by which Luther should be judged. He was no better and no worse. Only, we may add with surprise, that as a "reformer," better things, a higher standard, is expected of him, all the more so considering his character as a minister of the Gospel.



Speaking of the brutality of his age, so also as to its coarseness of speech, Luther was typical. His language in religious controversy was nothing less than foul, at times almost obscene. Catholicism to him was spiritual "harlotry," the scholastics were "sows," and so on up and down the gamut of the coarsest invectives. Here, too, whilst admitting that he was only exemplifying in an extreme form the billingsgate method of controversy characteristic of his times, might we not expect better things from a "reformer," more charity from a spiritual leader, more self-respect from a leader of the world's thought, more decency from the founder of a great religious movement, more tolerance from an apostle of religious freedom, more self-restraint and gentlemanliness from one who firmly believed himself inspired by God! May one not be pardoned a doubt whether God prefers his gospel to be preached with the slang and cursing and foul speech of the fish-market!

\* \* \* \* \*

As we lay down this life of Luther the question remains to be answered, perhaps will always remain not entirely answered, at least for an indefinite period of time: "How is it that Luther succeeded?"

To the present writer the whole movement loses, upon closer scrutiny, more and more of the character of a spiritual movement. Luther, of course, regarded it as such, and his conviction of the righteousness of his course may well be granted despite his unscrupulous use of unjustifiable means to advance the same, such as his unvarying subservience to secular authority, his vileness in invective, his advocacy of lying, his constant misrepresentations of his opponents' words and acts, his own frequent fits of despondency at the sight of the ruin wrought by him, his revolting coarseness and obscenity in speech. For, from first to last, he was possessed, obsessed by the idea of "Justification by faith," the only mark of consistency in him. That notion started him and directed him and stayed with him until death. And it was a theological notion.

But more and more does the theological aspect of the movement seem to be giving away before its political and social

aspects. Granting the theological ferment caused by Luther's teachings, the movement as a movement seems to have been dominated by non-theological forces. As a spiritual "reform" it cannot any longer be considered seriously. Luther's mental development, as we have seen, started independently of any idea of reform and long before he took up reform as a pretext. His subsequent writings and acts were dominated not by the notion of a moral reform but by a fanatic desire to utterly change the whole doctrinal character of Christianity. Neither did the movement result in any reform, a fact which weighed heavily upon Luther in the last unhappy years of his life. There is about the whole sad history absolutely nothing of that zeal for personal purity, that sweetness of manner, that calm study of moral conditions, that mystic beauty, that go with a great spiritual work. Instead, it is all war, cursing, vile imprecations, bloodshed, theological hatred, looseness of morals, lying, selfish aggrandizement, pillage of property, fanaticism, appeals to mob-passion, mercenary exploitation of church property by secular authority, substitution of personal abuse for sane debate, contempt for the very rights of reason—a veritable bedlam wherein Luther and his opponents mutually call one another insane, as many of them apparently were. In it every evil force in human nature seems to have been let loose, everything of spiritual delicacy shattered by contact with the volcanic, elemental passions of humanity. Call it, if you will, my Catholic prejudice. But I cannot see in this the work of God, a work of reform, a work of reconstruction. I can see in it only ruthless destruction. To say that good came out of it can be, for the sake of argument, granted without any withdrawal of this statement. Good also came out of the barbarian invasions that destroyed Roman civilization. Moreover, what good has come, came in spite of Luther, for the modern world does not now live up to a single one fundamental position taken by Luther, except his hatred of the Papacy. Were he alive now, he would not recognize a true follower in any modern man.

The real causes of Luther's success lay deeper than himself, and were altogether untheological. They seem to be ever more

and more political and social and racial. True! there was a world-wide demand for spiritual reform; true, also, this demand came as a potent ally to Luther after he commenced his work. However, there had been equally great demands for reform in previous centuries. The cry was raised by Bernard in the twelfth century no less potently than by Luther in the sixteenth. But what was that particular thing that gave it its fearfully destructive character in Luther's day?

The answer lies somewhere in a study of general world conditions. Far-fetched as it may seem at first sight, I would say that in mankind at large as a unit, just as in every particular man, there comes a time when it simply gets tired of monotony and longs for a change. Man is not stable. He gets tired of certain foods and pleasures and occupations, and changes them. The world in A. D. 1500 was thus tired. It had lived under Medievalism too long, for Medievalism had accomplished its mission of reconstructing society out of the shattered remnants of classic civilization and raw barbarian materials. Its ideals and its ideas and its grandeur were on the wane. The old ideal of a theory of the world-wide Christian Church and State, with the two heads, Pope and Emperor, was giving way before the rising national consciousness of its different political entities. Each nation was more and more assuming in its own borders political powers hitherto more or less submerged in the Pope and Emperor. With it grows an ever-increasing irritation at "foreign" interference. So that here, at the very outset, we understand in a flash how it was that the reform became such a political tool; how it was that it never could have succeeded as an ostensibly religious movement except for the support of the civil authorities; how it is that to this very day the most murderous and the most general argument against Rome on the part of Protestants is precisely its non-national character, the branding of Catholics as foreigners.

Add to this the general realignment of social forces then going on. The passing of the old guild system was revolutionizing the entire industrial world, leaving the poor at the mercy of an unscrupulous aristocracy. The extension of commerce

by the new geographical discoveries was making the old ways of doing business inadequate and out of date. With the gradual diminution of Papal political power the kings were more and more absorbing all political power into an absolute monarchy. Then, too, the age-long dislike of "Italian" interference. Three centuries before Luther was calling his "dear German people" to arms against Roman supremacy, St. Thomas A' Becket and Bishop Grosseteste in England were fiercely denouncing what they thought to be Roman incroachment upon English liberties in language as forcible, but not so coarse.

And so on. Everywhere, in all departments of life, we find a drifting away from old moorings. The change was inevitable: the revolution was not to be stopped. It is heard distinctly muttering from the lips of Savonarola long before Luther thunders it at Augsburg and Spiers. The seeds of the whirlwind are sown at Avignon long before it becomes the rugged tree at Wittenberg. The politics of Philip II, Francis I, Henry VIII, the German Protestant Princes, are as much its fruit as is Luther's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, more so in fact. The entrance of England as a nation under Wolsey's guidance into continental politics for the first time, the dismemberment and ruin of Germany in the Thirty Years War, the rapid but short-lived supremacy of the Spanish Empire, the slower but more enduring supremacy of the French monarchy, the intricacies of Richelieu's heartless diplomacy, are part and parcel of a whole world-wide upheaval in which the doctrine of justification by faith plays an insignificant rôle. In a word, all human society was changing from bottom to top. There was a sort of irresistible general spirit of uneasiness in the air. No man could have stopped it. No one man could have hindered it.

Luther's rôle was to suddenly crystallize all these hitherto loose elements of disruption. In this sense he was a leader, not because of his peculiar theological views, which were, after all, not original nor are today accepted, but because of his utterly revolutionary character and methods. This brutal brushing

aside of tradition, the Fathers, Councils, Popes; his almost anarchical onslaught upon the very idea of religious authority made him the very incarnation of this spirit of revolt from the past which is the keynote of that period. He was, indeed, the petrel flying on the crest of that awful storm in human affairs. This is the test of the extent and the nature of his distinction and his claim to greatness.

\* \* \* \* \*

We will not quibble over the meaning of the word "great." But we will only ask if Luther was a benefactor of the human race. Let his admirers, who, will, of course, answer "yes," however, reflect. That a change in human relations was inevitable in Luther's age is evident. But was the manner of that change beneficial? Is it good for any single man or humanity at large to brutally cast aside the past, all the sweetness, the tender traditions and loves that must cling to it? Can he do so without injuring his character? Does nature go by leaps? Rather, does it not develop? Is it not wise to preserve what was good in previous civilizations? Does not the world learn slowly and painfully, and cannot, therefore, afford to carelessly toss aside all its previous culture?

Yet were not these very mistakes made by Luther and his contemporaries? Did they not with one wave of the hand brusquely sweep aside all the wearily won progress of the Middle Ages—the development of some eleven centuries? Would it not, then, have been better for the human race had it rather gone forward more discreetly and preserved what was good in Medievalism and builded upon the sturdy foundations laid for them? What a magnificent edifice we moderns could have built had we done so. This is the burden of the charge which future historians will ever lay against such as Luther and Erasmus, that they *destroyed* for centuries so much that was of real value to the human race and just so much put back the human race in its progress. They destroyed as much as Attila and Genseric, even if they did it by satire and coarse abuse, and not by fire and sword. Today we are recognizing this awful mistake. The scholarly world is again turning back to the Middle Ages, delving in every corner of Europe for

precious information about those very ages, which, owing to the brutal ignorance of the sixteenth century, were allowed to be forgotten. We are striving to *undo* the work of the Reformers and the Humanists, striving to get back the civilization which they thought they had condemned to oblivion. No more significant condemnation could there be of Luther's work on the part of the thinking men of today than precisely this feverish interest in Medieval culture. It is a recognition by men of thought that the Reformation was a *mistake* in the history of culture, a retrogression in the mental development of mankind in the sense of it being a distinct *loss* of something inherently good. Every pretty life of Francis of Assisi or original quaint angel of Fra Angelico or curio in carving of a Medieval silversmith, every edition of a forgotten Medieval writer by the Rolls Series or of some university's cartulary or gild's regulations or town-charter, every one of these acts constitutes on the part of us moderns a protest against the revolution of which Luther was the main personality. All of us, even Luther's own admirers and religious followers, thus unconsciously condemn his work as a work of destruction and logically refuse to him the claim of being a benefactor of the human race.

Let this be sufficient for present reflection. It is significant enough. One could, it is true, point out how Luther's labors have resulted in hopelessly dividing the Church of Christ and making of it a laughing-stock to the heathen, of making so many millions of human beings, in consequence, religious indifferentists; of taking away from the very Bible all mark of authority; of having drenched Europe with blood and placed a feeling of ineradicable hatred in the hearts of Christians today; but all that will, of course, be misconstrued as controversy. We are content for the present estimate of Luther's benefactions to humanity to state, as above, that the entire world of thought is endeavoring now to *undo his work* by rescuing from the oblivion cast upon them by him those very same Middle Ages whose Catholicity he hated with undying hate. His own namesakes today are thus unconsciously condemning his work as a mistake, a halt in human development, a loss to mental culture, an *injury* and not a benefaction to the race.

It is with genuine regret that we say this of Luther. His was a rare chance, seldom given in history, to perform a work for humanity equal to that given to any man. In some ways he had the power to do a great work—his enthusiasm, his capacity for work, his boldness, could have, if rightly directed, resulted in causing a real reformation without the awful destruction that he did cause. As it is, he failed signally. Both the Church at large and humanity as well lost when he blundered.

And it is with equally genuine pity for him that we close this study of his life. Stormy petrel that he was, he found little peace of mind in those turbulent times. And when the evening shadows were closing round him his heart grew heavier. Dyspepsia, nervous headaches, chronic granular disease, gout, sciatica, abscesses, vertigo and gallstone colic ravaged a body already worn out by excessive work and the excitement of a life ever of warfare. One by one his comrades at arms deserted him, either through difference of opinion (which Luther never could forgive) or through sheer inability to put up with his ever-increasing irritability. His memory then plays tricks upon him, giving rise to the legends and exaggerations which have for three centuries so distorted his biography. His heart grew sadder and sadder at the sight of the barren results of his work. His last sermon at Wittenberg (Jan. 17th, 1546) voices his despondency: "Usury, drunkenness, adultery, murder, assassination, all these can be noticed, and the world understands them to be sins, but the devil's bride, reason, that pert prostitute struts in and will be clever and means what she says, that it is the Holy Ghost." *Cath Encyclop., Ib.*) And that very same day he pens the pathetic lines: "I am old, decrepit, indolent, weary, cold, and now have the sight of but one eye." And yet, amidst all this, in the very shadow of death, he rouses himself to the composition of his coarsest and bitterest pamphlets against the Jews and the arch-enemy, the Pope.

Thus he died unforgiving, with his heart full of hatred, leaving to his spiritual children a legacy of hate for their Catholic fellow-humans, the persistence of which even into this enlightened age is one of the strangest and saddest of all phenomena in human history.

The ineffable pity of it all.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

## PEASANT PROPRIETORSHIP IN IRELAND.

---

In a former paper was given a brief survey of the Irish Agrarian question before 1880. The present paper will give an account of the remedial legislation which has been adopted in the matter since that time; firstly, for the creation of dual ownership and secondly, for the creation of peasant proprietorship.

### I.

In 1881 a Royal Commission reported that the Land Act of 1870 had completely failed to protect the property rights of the Irish tenants; that the value of the tenants' improvements had been absorbed by the raising of rents. Mr. Gladstone, in the course of the same year had an Act passed through Parliament based on the report of the Commission. This Act embodied what are known as the three F's—fair rent, fixity of tenure and freedom of sale. The Government finally abandoned its *laissez-faire* policy and stepped in as arbiter between the landlord and tenant. (1) A tribunal was established to which tenants might have recourse in order to have a fair rent fixed. (2) Once the rent had been fixed it was to remain so for fifteen years, during which the tenant could not be evicted except for non-payment. (3) The tenant was empowered to sell his land, but before doing so he was obliged to consult the landlord, who had the right of pre-emption. These are the famous three F's. The law was to be administered by the newly-created Land Court, consisting of a judicial commissioner who was a Judge of the Supreme Court and an assistant Land Commissioner. Sub-Commissioners were to be appointed in the various provinces by the Land Commission, and to these all cases for the fixing of fair rents were in the first instance to be referred. Apart from the Land Commission, rents might be fixed also by County Courts or by free agreement between landlord and tenants.



The legislation of 1881 seemed to please nobody. Landlords were naturally chagrined at the thought of becoming mere rent chargers, and the number of Agrarian crimes continued to increase. Was the law, then, wrong in principle or did the fault lie with the Irish people? The Act undoubtedly lacked some of the features which would have widened the sphere of its operation, but this can scarcely justify the attitude of the Irish leaders toward it. It had been better on all sides had they given it a fair trial. It was the best that Mr. Gladstone could do at the time. It must be remembered that he could not go further than English public opinion allowed.

The objections of the Irish leaders to the legislation were mainly three. They objected to it in the first instance because it excluded tenants in arrears; secondly, because it excluded lease holders; thirdly, because it contained no standard for determining a fair rent. The Act of 1882 removed the first objection, stipulating that the tenants in arrears whose annual rent was less than thirty pounds should get a clear receipt on the payment of one year's rent.

The government agreed to pay another year's rent and the landlord was obliged to forfeit the remainder. Of the 135,977 claims for relief under this Act 129,952 were allowed. The sacrifice made by the government amounted to 812,321 pounds.<sup>1</sup>

The second objection was removed in 1887 when leaseholders were admitted to the benefits of the Act. Heretofore it had only applied to tenants from year to year, but the Act of 1887 declared that all tenants who had entered into leases not exceeding ninety-nine years were to be subject to the provisions of the Act of 1881 as if they were tenants from year to year. By these amendments 150,000 tenants were admitted to the benefits of the Act. Many of these were persons who under moral compulsion had contracted out their rights under the Act of 1870. The landlords who had taken advantage of the contracting out clauses were now caught in the meshes of legislation.

The first two objections had now been removed, but the third and the one most difficult to remove still remained. What was

<sup>1</sup> Brien's *Life of Parnell*, p. 340.

to be the standard of a fair rent? The Irish members maintained that Parliament should have fixed the standard, and it might easily have done so if it had only determined once for all the question of the ownership of improvements. But so long as this question remained unsettled there was no possibility of determining a standard of fair rent for Ireland. Adjustments of rent were bound to work an injustice against the tenants in many instances; the tenants' improvements were bound to be confiscated and they themselves robbed of all incentive to better their conditions. Since 1870 the presumption of English Law had been that the improvements belonged to the tenant, but this presumption created by the Law of 1870 had been in part nullified by a provision of the same law specifying length of enjoyment as a sufficient compensation for improvements. In the debate on the Act of 1881 Mr. Healy suggested a clause to the effect "that no rent should be made payable in respect of any improvements made by the tenant or his predecessors for which the tenant or his predecessors shall not have been paid by the landlord or his predecessors." As a concession to the opposition of the Lords, the clause was afterwards modified by the addition of the words "or otherwise compensated." The addition of these words gave the courts a chance of nullifying the whole clause and of practically confiscating the tenants' improvements. A case was brought before the Dublin Court of Appeals and it was decided that the clause referred to improvements specified by the Act of 1870 to the exclusion of a great number of improvements included by that Act and that under the provisions of the same Act enjoyment of these improvements for upwards of twenty years should be counted sufficient compensation. The effect of this decision was to deprive the Irish tenants of the benefits of a great number of their improvements and to hand these improvements over to the landlord.

In this condition the law was allowed to remain until the Land Act of 1896 reversed the decision of the court and restored to the tenants the right to their improvements. According to this Act (1) No rent shall be payable by the tenants for improvements by reason of these improvements not being suit-

able to the land; (2) mere enjoyment of improvements for a period of twenty years or longer shall not be counted sufficient compensation; (3) the law also laid down certain definite rules for the guidance of the Commissioners in determining a fair rent; (a) they shall first estimate the gross rent which shall be determined by the value of the product; (b) they shall then deduct the amount due to tenants' improvements; (c) after having done this they shall determine the net fair rent.<sup>2</sup>

Had this question of the ownership of improvements been definitely settled in the beginning the great defect of the Land Commission would have been remedied. Once the idea was spread abroad that the Commissioners took advantage of improvements to raise rents the tenants were discouraged in the making of improvements. Nothing could have been more detrimental to the interests of the Irish tenant. He had inherited from the past a prejudice against making improvements because he had learned that he was thereby only increasing his landlord's rent. The new legislation tended to perpetuate this prejudice and thus to retard the economic progress of the Irish tenants.

But while the legislation of 1881 has conduced to the perpetuation of some of the traditional faults of the Irish tenants, it has considerably bettered their economic condition. It has put them in the position of making a livelihood off their land. Between August 22, 1881 and March 31, 1912, out of 490,300 occupiers of agricultural holdings in Ireland, 379,348 have had fair rents fixed for the first statutory term, receiving an average reduction of twenty and seven-tenths per cent. on their old rents. Of this number 140,540 have had fair rents fixed for a second statutory term, receiving an average reduction of nineteen and five-tenths per cent. on first-term rents. Of this number again 676 have had fair rents fixed for a third statutory term, receiving an average reduction of ten per cent. on second-term rents. These reductions would make the average judicial rent in Ireland at present less than ten shillings per statute acre.

<sup>2</sup> Act, Sec. 1, Sub-sec. 3.

## II.

No matter how unbiased the judgments of the Land Court might have been, it could not have satisfied both parties. Every reduction of rent brought forth the severest criticism from the landlord's side. The tenants, too, were very rarely satisfied with their reductions. They maintained, among other things, that their reductions did not compensate for the fall in agricultural prices. It was therefore evident that no fixing of fair rents could satisfactorily settle the Irish Agrarian question and restore peace between landlord and tenant. There was bound to be friction so long as the inveterate enemies continued to meet in the courts every fifteen years to fight over the diminishing rent.

Back in 1870 a more perfect scheme of reform had been proposed to Mr. Gladstone by his friend John Bright. According to Bright the only means of solving the problem of land tenure in Ireland was the creation of peasant proprietorship. Mr. Gladstone hesitated. He saw countless difficulties in the way of creating peasant proprietors. He could not believe "that the purchase and owning of land by a few of the more fortunate tenants could bring any essential benefit to the people as a whole."<sup>3</sup> The great statesman had undoubtedly before his mind a difficulty which was to beset all future legislation aiming at the establishment of peasant proprietors. What would be the advantage of peasant proprietorship for the tenants occupying uneconomic holdings; namely, for those whose holdings are too small and too poor to afford a decent livelihood to the owner? Taking fifteen acres as the minimum for an economic holding, we find 200,000 uneconomic holdings out of a total of 490,315 in Ireland.<sup>4</sup> Peasant proprietorship might give the occupiers of these holdings twenty to thirty per cent. of a reduction on their fair rents, but this would not be sufficient to make their holdings economic, especially when these holdings, as is gen-

<sup>3</sup> Morley's Gladstone, Vol. 2, p. 283.

<sup>4</sup> Census of 1911.

erally the case, are situated in the most infertile parts of Ireland.

Despite this opposition to the land policy of Mr. Bright, Gladstone consented to introduce purchase clauses in the Church Disestablishment Act of 1869. These clauses enabled the tenants of the Church lands to become owners of their holdings. The government was to advance three-fourths of the purchase money which the tenants were obliged to repay in thirty-two annuities. Under this Act 6,057 tenants became proprietors of their holdings. The government continued the same policy in the Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870. The Bright clauses of that Act specified that the government would advance two-thirds of the purchase money to tenants who should buy their land through the Landed Estates Court. Repayments were to be made by the tenants in thirty-five annuities. Under this Act 877 tenants became owners of their lands. The Land Act of 1881 also contained purchase clauses which empowered the Land Commission to advance three-fourths of the purchase money to tenants for the purchase of their holdings. Repayments were to be made in the same manner as under the Act of 1870. Only 731 tenants became proprietors under the Act of 1881.

The first legislative attempts in the direction of peasant proprietorship had one obvious defect; they required too much from the tenants. The Irish tenants could not as a rule afford to pay one-third or one-fourth of the purchase money, and for this reason they were unable to take advantage of the purchase clauses of the Acts of 1869, 1870 and 1881.

The Irish members demanded "the land for the people," hence they severely criticized the Acts of 1870 and 1881 as mere half-way measures. Englishmen, on the other hand, were loath to invest money in the purchase of Irish land. To say the least they did not think it a safe investment on account of the recurring seasons of distress and the periodic famines. It took a long time to convince them that land purchase was a safe and sane policy and the only policy that could finally solve the Irish land problem. In 1885 the conservatives adopted

land purchase as their Irish policy and in the same year the Ashbourne Act—the first great legislative movement in the direction of peasant proprietorship—was passed by Parliament. The Ashbourne Act empowered the Land Commission to advance the whole amount to be paid by the tenant for the purchase of his holding. On no account, however, could the advances made by the Commission exceed in all the sum of five million pounds. The landlord was to be paid in cash, four-fifths down, one-fifth of the purchase money being retained by the government as security against non-payment by the tenants. The tenants were obliged to repay the money advanced for the purchase of their lands at the rate of four per cent. for forty-nine years, three per cent. on the principal and one per cent. for a sinking fund.

The popularity of the new measure was sufficiently attested by its success during the next three years. Applications for advances poured in at such a rate that the five million pounds was soon expended. Another five millions was voted in 1888, but by 1891 that, too, had been exhausted. In a short period of six years 25,367 tenants had become owners of their lands. The landlords' interests were capitalized at an average of seventeen and a half years' purchase; *i. e.*, seventeen and a half times the annual rent.

The Act of 1885 was considerably modified by the legislation of 1891 and 1896. The government realized that the creation of peasant proprietorship alone would not solve the Land question. It was therefore deemed necessary to pass special subsidiary legislation for the poorer or congested districts.<sup>5</sup> Steps were also taken toward expediting the creation of peasant proprietorship, and for this purpose Parliament decreed that the landlords for the future should be paid in land stock instead of cash as under the Act of 1885, and that the burden of securing the Treasury against non-payment of annuities should be transferred from the landlord to a complicated guarantee fund, based on taxation. It also established a system of decadal reductions

<sup>5</sup> See *Catholic University Bulletin* for January, 1914.

according to which the amount paid into the sinking fund was, at the end of each decade, to be deducted from the whole amount payable by the tenant, and his future rent calculated on the remainder. For instance, a tenant whose former rent was a hundred pounds, buys out his farm at seventeen years' purchase; that is, for a nominal sum of 1,700 pounds represented by land stock. On this nominal amount, which is advanced by the government, the tenant is obliged to pay four per cent. for the first ten years, making his annual rent for this period sixty-eight pounds. At the beginning of the second decade, the amount already paid into the sinking fund is deducted from the whole amount payable and the interest calculated on the remainder. This makes his rent for the second decade sixty-one pounds, four shillings.

The system of decadal reductions was a wise provision, for a tenant owing to a slump in agricultural prices or a series of crop failures, might not be able to pay the same amount in ten years as he was paying at first. The complicated guarantee fund based on a lack of confidence in the Irish tenants was an altogether unnecessary provision, as subsequent experience amply demonstrated. Instead of serving any useful purpose, it so complicated the law as to bring land purchase almost to a standstill.

The substitution of land stock for cash payments made the progress of land purchase depend on the fluctuations of the stock market. So long as the stock remained at par the landlord would be willing to sell his estate, but when stock went below par he would be no longer willing to sell. Between 1896 and 1900 the price of stock never went below par. Sometimes it went as high as one hundred and ten. A large number of landlords took advantage of the rise in the price of stock to enter agreements for the sale of their land. The number of applications made to the Commissioners rose from 1,503 in the year ending March 31, 1896 to 6,911 in the year ending March 31, 1900. But after the Boer War the value of stock suddenly went down with the result that land purchase came to a standstill.

## III.

In 1900, it seemed as if the Irish ideal—"the land for the people"—would never be realized. Fifteen years had passed since the British Parliament took its first great step in the direction of peasant proprietorship, and yet only 70,000 out of a total of 490,301 tenants had become owners of their land. The worst landlords still held out, obliging their tenants to pay twenty-five per cent. more rent than the neighborly tenants. The people grew discontented. Discontent and dissatisfaction spread according as the landlords became more obstinate in refusing to sell their estates. A general cry for compulsory purchase arose. A new organization sprang into existence and carried on a vigorous campaign against the obstinate landlords. So intense did the agitation become that it seemed as if there was going to be a revival under the auspices of the United Irish League, of the Agrarian warfare of Land League days. Mr. Wyndham, the Chief Secretary, realizing that something had to be done to allay the discontent of the people, introduced a bill into Parliament offering greater inducements to the landlords to sell and to the tenants to buy than had been offered under the Ashbourne or Balfour Acts. The reunited Irish party unanimously rejected the bill. At that time nothing other than compulsory purchase would have satisfied them. Before long, however, they were compelled to recede from their position and to make a compromise with the landlords. A conference was called to meet in Dublin to which representatives of the landlords and tenants were invited in order to discuss a policy of conciliation and at this conference a scheme of land purchase acceptable to both parties was drawn up.

The Wyndham Land Act of 1903 was based on the report of the Land conference. Its object was the speedy creation of peasant proprietorship which Mr. Wyndham thought would be accomplished within fifteen years. Like all previous Acts, it provided for the voluntary transfer of land from the landlord to the tenants. The independent landlord had refused to sell his land for depreciated land stock, hence it was thought necessary



for the future to pay him in cash, and for this purpose the government proposed to raise the sum of 100,000,000 pounds—the amount required to buy out the landlords who had not yet sold their land. The government was to raise this money by the issuance of stock, bearing interest at two and three-fourths per cent.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to the amount necessary to buy out their lands, the government offered a bonus of twelve million pounds to the landlords in order to induce them to sell. This bonus was to be distributed at the rate of twelve per cent. on the purchase money. The transfer of land was to be made through the hands of the Estates Commissioners, a new body created within the Land Commission, whose duty was to ratify all agreements entered into between the landlord and tenant for the sale and purchase of the Landlord's Estates.<sup>7</sup> All the advances made by the Land Commission have to be repaid by the tenants at the rate of three and one-fourth per cent. (two and three-fourths per cent. interest and one-half per cent. on the sinking fund) for sixty-eight and a half years. The interest to be paid on the advance is therefore the same as under the legislation of 1896, but the annual sum to be paid into the sinking fund is reduced from one to one-half per cent.<sup>8</sup> If the tenants refuse or are unable to meet their annuities, the deficit must be charged on the local taxation grants made by the Imperial Parliament.<sup>9</sup> Any loss sustained by the government in the issue of stock was to be made good out of the Irish Development Grant, which consisted of 185,000 pounds due to Ireland as an equivalent for the 1,400,000 pounds voted for educational purposes in England in 1902. When this fund should be exhausted, the deficit would have to be supplied out of the Imperial Grants for local purposes, and this would, of course, ultimately mean an increase of local taxation.

If one were to judge by the number of prospective proprietors which it has created, the Land Act of 1903 must be considered a great success. The number of purchases complete in the

<sup>6</sup> Acts, Sects. 27, 28, 29.

<sup>7</sup> Act, Sect. 45.

<sup>8</sup> Act, Sect. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Act, Sects. 26, 36.

period from November 1, 1903 to March 31, 1912 amounted to 136,350, and the advances made by the Commissioners in the same period amounted to 47,570,837 pounds, while the amount of the advances applied for was 82,311,466 pounds.<sup>10</sup> The average price which the landlord received for his land was twenty-two and nine-tenths times its annual rent, or twenty-five times, if we take the bonus into account. This represents a relative increase of forty per cent. on former prices.<sup>11</sup> The average reduction received by the tenants was about twenty-five cent.

The best testimony in favor of the Act of 1903 is the almost universal satisfaction with which it has been received by both landlords and tenants. The landlords were well pleased with the price which the Act held out to them; and while the tenants felt that they were paying a very high price for their land, still they were satisfied, for they knew that since the government was opposed to compulsory purchase, the only alternative which would induce the landlords to sell was a high price.

After the legislation of 1903 had been in operation for six years, it was discovered that some important modifications had to be made in it if the work of land purchase was to go on. The advances which had been made up to date entailed a great financial loss in as much as the government had been compelled to issue stock at an average discount of twelve per cent. In order to raise one hundred pounds, it had to issue stock having a nominal value of one hundred and twelve pounds while the tenant only paid interest on stock having a nominal value of one hundred pounds. The deficit so far had been met out of the Development Grant, but it was discovered that if the government continued much longer to issue stock at such a loss, the Development Grant would be exhausted and further losses would have to be borne by the Irish ratepayers. This defect in the legislation of 1903 was remedied in 1909 by a provision that for the future the Treasury would raise money by the issue of stock bearing interest at the rate of three per cent. instead of two and

<sup>10</sup> Thom's Official Directory, p. 779.

<sup>11</sup> Dubois' Contemporary Ireland, p. 292.

three-fourths as under the former Act.<sup>12</sup> Any losses sustained by the Treasury in the issue of stock were to be made good in the first instance out of the Development Grant and as soon as that was exhausted, out of money provided by Parliament.<sup>13</sup>

In 1909 it was also deemed necessary to make certain modifications in regard to the bonus to be given to the landlords. Twelve millions had been set aside by Mr. Wyndham for this purpose, which would give the landlords a twelve per cent. bonus on the assumption that 100,000,000 pounds should be sufficient to buy out their estates. But when the period for which the bonus was to be given had expired (November 1, 1908) proceedings had been instituted for the sale of estates to the amount of seventy or eighty millions, and it was estimated that it would take another eighty millions to buy out the remainder of the land. The Act of 1909 removed the twelve million limit, and also changed the method of distributing the bonus. It determined that for the future it should be distributed in a graduated scale ranging from three to eighteen per cent. in inverse proportion to the number of years purchase. The higher the price which the landlord received for his land, the smaller would be his bonus, and the lower the price the larger the bonus.

The Act of 1909 was an improvement on the former legislation in many respects. By raising the rate of interest to be paid on land stock it made it easier for the government to secure money; it relieved the tenants from the burden of bearing the losses resulting from the flotation of stock below par; and as a result of the increased rate of interest to be paid by the government on land stock, the tenants have to pay an additional one-fourth per cent. on their annuities.

Although an improvement on the legislation of 1903, the Act of 1909 does not seem to have expedited in any great degree the work of land purchase. In fact it does not seem to have worked as well as the former Act. The amount of the advances applied for under the Act of 1903 up to March 31st, 1912, was 82,311,448 pounds while the amount of the advances applied for under the Act of 1909 up to that date amounted to

<sup>12</sup> Act, Sect. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Act, Sect. 7.

3,460,073 pounds.<sup>14</sup> The foregoing figures seem to show that the progress of land purchase has been rather slow since 1909. This slowness, however, is not due to any fault in the existing legislation. The real reason for it is that nearly all the landlords who were willing to sell had already entered into agreements with their tenants and those who have so far refused to consider the question will not sell their lands except at excessively high rates or under compulsion. There is, then, only one means left of completing the work of creating a peasant proprietorship and that is compulsory sale. The idea would undoubtedly cause a shock to those who over-emphasize the rights of private property even when there is a question of ameliorating the condition of a whole people and giving them an opportunity of securing a decent livelihood. When John Bright and John Stuart Mill first proposed the compulsory buying out of the landlords over forty years ago they excited a storm of opposition in England. Englishmen at that time did not feel that the Irish had any human rights to be protected; they were satisfied that the existing system was good enough for Ireland, and even after they had been convinced that the Irish tenants deserved legislative consideration they still held back from what seemed to them the extreme measure of compelling the landlords to sell their estates. They would try every other means first before resorting to compulsion. They would offer a high price and a large bonus to the landlords in order to induce them to sell to their tenants. By this policy of conciliation the government has been able to establish a large number of peasant proprietors. But for the past five years, it has become more and more apparent that any system which leaves the landlords free to sell their estates can never satisfy the demands of the Irish tenants or complete the land policy of the government.

In 1909 the Liberal government found that a system of conciliation could not solve the problem of the congested estates. It was, therefore, deemed necessary to furnish the Land Commissioners with compulsory powers of acquiring land for the

<sup>14</sup> Thom's Official Directory, p. 779.

tenants of such estates ; and the same compulsory powers, which were given to the Commissioners to acquire land in the congested estates outside of the Congested Districts were also given to the Congested Districts Board to acquire land inside the Congested Districts.

The leaders of the Liberal Party are now convinced that the same policy of compulsory purchase which has already been applied in the congested estates, must be extended to the whole country. They are convinced that compulsory purchase is the only means left of completing the work of creating a peasant proprietorship in Ireland. A bill for the purpose of endowing the Commissioners with compulsory powers of acquiring land was introduced into the last session of Parliament and this bill will undoubtedly become law within the next two years. Then will the Irish ideal "the land for the people" be realized.

JOHN O'GRADY.

## FROM JOHN STUART MILL TO WILLIAM JAMES.

### INTRODUCTION.

English philosophy contains throughout its course a predominant appeal to experience. From the days of its founder, Francis Bacon, the empirical method is claimed by all successive philosophers to be the one method of knowledge, whatever be the differences of their individual standpoint. As T. M. Forsyth puts it: "Nothing is more characteristic of English philosophy than the insistence, on the part of each of the thinkers in turn, that his system is grounded on experience. However they differ from one another either in their fundamental tenets or in points of detail, they agree that philosophy consists in reflexion on, or interpretation of, experience. The one common feature throughout the variations of English philosophy is this insistence on experience as the ultimate starting point and basis. This constitutes an element of agreement underlying its opposition."<sup>1</sup>

Bacon's philosophy, as embodied in the *Novum Organum*, manifests his zeal for that "closeness to fact" which is the distinctive feature of every inductive method. He wishes to renounce the elevation of abstract thought above fact. The renovation of philosophy is to be effected by a return to experience and a new devotion to particular facts, thus rising step by step to universal truths.<sup>2</sup>

With the next great English thinker, Thomas Hobbes, the deductive method, indeed, again acquires predominance. But it has nothing of the arbitrary *à priori* character of Descartes and his continental followers. Philosophy, says Hobbes, is a reasoning concerning experience. We must begin it with a contemplation of experience in all its complex variety of

<sup>1</sup> T. M. Forsyth, *English Philosophy*, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1910, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Novum Organum*, bk. I. Aphorisms 19, 22.

features and seek to detect their common aspects and general principles. Such principles must then be employed for the explanation of phenomena, and the more general of them used to account for the less general. This is the rational interpretation of experience, or the explanation of it by general principles.<sup>3</sup>

But Hobbes shows a more profound conception than Bacon of the philosophic problem, in pushing his inquiry to the examination of the ultimate constitution of experience itself.<sup>4</sup> He finds the fundamental fact of experience to be *ipsum τὸ φαίνεσθαι*. Accordingly the first and foremost problem of philosophy concerns the constitution and origin of phenomena as such.

In demanding as prerequisite the inquiry concerning the character of phenomena as such, Hobbes becomes the direct forerunner of John Locke. It needs but a slight shifting of the emphasis in his manner of putting the problem. Hobbes did not differentiate the investigation of phenomena as facts of consciousness from that of their physical or physiological condition. Locke, on the contrary, disregards the question of the dependence of conscious facts on organic facts, and lays the entire stress on the investigation of the ideas themselves.<sup>5</sup>

He begins his account of the nature and origin of ideas by distinguishing two sources or kinds of experience, sensation and reflection. It is the first time that reflection is regarded as a source of experience. Again the mind is said to be passive in the reception of its ideas. Consequently experience, consisting ultimately of a multiplicity of unitary items of consciousness, is the outcome of the juxta-position of individual minds with an independently existing world. This antithesis of material and mental world gives rise to the central problem of modern philosophy, the initial phase of the problem being to account for the origin of experience concerning reality on the supposition of the mutual independence of mind and matter. This independent interpretation of conscious experience from the nature of its own content works the transition from the dogmatic to the critical stand-point. However, the ideas are still considered as rep-

<sup>3</sup> *De Corpore*, ch. vi.

<sup>4</sup> *De Corpore*, ch. xxv.

<sup>5</sup> Essay concerning Human Understanding, bk. I., ch. I.

representations of external realities; only the secondary qualities are denied.<sup>6</sup>

George Berkeley, continuing this method of intra-mental analysis, soon arrives at the denying of the validity of any distinction between primary and secondary qualities; both are purely mental. And pushing the analysis still further, he formulates his famous principle: the *esse* of things is *percipi*; their existence consists in their being consciously experienced.<sup>7</sup> This deduction is quite logical, for if sensible qualities as we actually experience them are the only material existence we can ever know, then our experience is quite the same with or without a material substance underlying.

The philosophy of David Hume is thus foreshadowed: Our conscious life is the experiencing of sensations, and these sensations, or "impressions" are the elements of our knowledge. Originally there is in our conscious life no distinction between ideas and things as objects of these ideas, nor again between mind and its ideas, as products of the mind. Any such conception is already an interpretation of the character of our ideas as contents of experience, and the criterion of the meaning and truth of any concept is the impression, or impressions, from which it is derived. Therefore, the idea of a substance, whether material or mental, is a mere fiction to which no objectivity corresponds.<sup>8</sup>

Regarding the relations obtaining between ideas, Hume wavers. There are passages where he resolves all relations into natural relations, and admits as the only "bond of union" or "principle of connexion" among ideas—the only "quality by which one idea naturally introduces another"—the principle of association. In other passages, however, he speaks of intuitively certain ideas, admitting a distinction between "relations of ideas," and "matters of fact," the former discoverable by thought without any reference to actual existence, the latter ascertainable only from experience.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, bk. II., ch. VIII.

<sup>7</sup> *Principles of Human Knowledge*, § 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*, sect. II.



Hume's philosophical heir is John Stuart Mill. The disciple goes beyond his master in resolutely denying any distinction between immanent and exterior relations of ideas. Exterior relations alone exist, and they find their explanation entirely in the law of association. All differentiation between psychology and epistemology is thus definitely done away with, the latter is subordinated to the former. It means the inauguration of psychologism.

Thus English philosophy from Bacon down to Mill presents a continuous development in accordance with the principle that the basis of all knowledge is experience.

But never, perhaps, was this appeal to experience so persistently and loudly reiterated as by the representatives of the latest phase of English philosophy, the champions of pragmatism. Besides, William James, their leader, lays claim to John Stuart Mill as the thinker from whom he "first learned the pragmatic openness of mind." Now the biological conception of mental life, and the dynamic theory of truth propounded by James, at first sight seem very unlike Mill's apparently static principle of association. It will, therefore, be the aim of the present paper to trace the points of contact between these two philosophers with a view of establishing, whether the constant continuity and evolution that mark the progress of English philosophy from Bacon to Mill, is likewise found between Mill and James. For the sake of clearness and brevity the inquiry will be limited to the study of the central questions in epistemology.

#### PSYCHOLOGY AND THE PROBLEM OF UNIVERSALS.

It has just been said that Mill first subordinated logic to psychology, thus inaugurating in England the school of psychologists. The arguments of the latter are well known: Concepts, judgments, reasonings, constituting thought, are facts of consciousness, psychic operations; hence the laws of thought are psychological laws. They present merely a translation into normative formulas of the regularities observed in our mental operations. Consequently the so-called logic laws are simply

facts to be established inductively; they have no *à priori* ideal character of necessity founded upon a transcendental reason. We cannot, therefore, leave the territory of psychology; epistemology is but a chapter of psychology; its laws are subjective and changing, conscious experience being their only foundation.<sup>9</sup>

To this the supporters of ideal logic have always answered that the theory of knowledge is, indeed, born on the territory of psychic facts, but that by the very analysis of these facts of consciousness we are led to a distinction between laws of psychic activity and ideal laws, the former regarding the psychic act and the latter its content, the one the *Denkerlebnis* and the other the *Denkinhalt*. In the midst of the stream of consciousness, they maintain, there reigns an ideal objectivity, namely, fixed intemporal relations of the "intended" objects, and all that psychology says of the dynamic nature of conscious activity leaves intact the entirely different character of these ideal objects. We see the intrinsic relations of congruity founded on the inmost nature of the objects, we do not posit them; this gives us absolute truth. Evidence is hence no accessory sentiment superadded to our subjective judgments, but our very consciousness of an objective agreement.<sup>10</sup>

Mill himself starts his analysis by contending that the problem of knowledge can only be solved by remaining within consciousness, and by analyzing its contents. And what does he find consciousness to be? It is a series of feelings, that is, of sensations, thoughts, emotions and volitions, more or less numerous and complicated.<sup>11</sup> Objects, things do not enter the conscious field except by their representations. And since all the contents of consciousness are subjective, these relations must likewise be subjective, forming, as they do, but a part of the concrete thread of consciousness, subject as such to the general

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Geyer, *Grundlagen der Logik und Erkenntnislehre*, Muenster, H. Schoening, 1909, p. 266.

<sup>10</sup> Joseph Geyer, *Lehrbuch der Allgemeinen Psychologie*, Muenster, Schoening, 1912, pp. 546-556.

<sup>11</sup> *A System of Logic*, George Routledge, London, 1905, p. 47.

causal laws of the latter. In other words, truth corresponds to psychologic law.

How rigorously Mill defends this subordination of logic to psychology may be seen from the following characteristic page: "If this be meant (that ideal laws belong to logic) we are landed in a strange conclusion. There is a science, psychology, which is the science of all mental phenomena, and among others, of the phenomena of thought, and yet another science, logic, is required to teach us its necessary phenomena. There is a portion of the properties of thought which is expressly excluded from the science which treats of thought, to be reserved as the matter of another science, and these are precisely its necessary properties. Those which are merely contingent, 'such as may or may not appear'—the properties which are not common to all thought, or do not belong to it at all times—these, it seems to be said, psychology knows something about: but the necessary properties, 'such as cannot but appear'—the properties which all thoughts possess, which thought must possess, without the possession of which it would not be thought—these psychology knows not of, and it is the office of a different science to investigate them. We may next expect to be told that the science of dynamics knows nothing of the laws of motion, the composition of forces, the theory of continuous and accelerating force, the doctrines of momentum, *vis viva*, etc., it only knows of mind power, and water power, steam power and animal power."<sup>12</sup>

If we turn to James, we will find the same genetic view of truth. Perhaps this appears nowhere more lucidly than in his way of handling the great problem which forms the pivotal epistemological question between psychologists and the supporters of Pure Logic, namely, the problem of Universals.

It was the analytical genius of Kant that first posed this problem in its modern critical form. For ten years, the philosopher of Koenigsberg tells us, he struggled and meditated asking himself on what to base the absolute, transcendental value of the universal judgments, the categories admitted by common sense,

<sup>12</sup> An examination of Sir W. Hamilton's *Philosophy*, Third Edition, London, p. 443.

seeing that all our concrete experiences are individual. In his technical terminology: "How are synthetic *à priori* judgments possible?" On analyzing the *Gewühl der Erscheinungen und Rhapsodie der Wahrnehmungen* of our conscious experience, he found within the mind a unitive function which, when put in presence of the diversity of sensible experience, construes the categories. These categories are consequently but the different possible ways in which the sense data may be synthetized, the intrinsic relations uniting them. The syntheses lie buried in the sense data, and the mind in discovering them actualizes them. The union is, therefore, not arbitrary, and the resulting judgments, the categories, have an objective, universal value.<sup>13</sup>

James' way of approaching the problem of Universals will show us besides the psychologic, his specifically pragmatic point of view. For him the activity of the mind is only a chapter of general biology. Its purpose is to adapt us to our surroundings, and to prepare our reactions.<sup>14</sup> Now the better to handle the stream of concrete experiences, man, says James, in very early times invented certain *Denkmittel*, a system of general concepts, categories, to which he refers the impressions presenting themselves, thus classifying and understanding them more easily. Nothing objective, however, corresponds to these categories; they result solely from the repetition of experiences. Had experience been simple, logic would have been impossible.<sup>15</sup>

The categories are, then, merely human "artefacts," instrumental and fundamental ways of thinking, discoveries of our exceedingly remote ancestors, which have been able to preserve themselves throughout the experience of all subsequent time. But it might be that such categories, unimaginable by us today, would have proved on the whole as serviceable for handling our experiences mentally as those which we actually use.<sup>16</sup>

In fact, what does history tell us of the evolution of logic?

<sup>13</sup> We are here adopting Riehl's objective interpretation of Kant; cf. Alois Riehl, *Der Philosophische Kritizismus I*,<sup>2</sup> Leipzig, Engelmann, 1908, pp. 499 ff.

<sup>14</sup> A Pluralistic Universe, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1909, p. 350.

<sup>15</sup> Pragmatism, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1910, p. 179.

<sup>16</sup> Pragmatism, pp. 170-171.

When the first logical and natural uniformities, the first laws, were discovered, men were so carried away by the clearness, beauty and simplification that resulted that they believed themselves to have deciphered authentically the eternal thoughts of the Almighty. His mind also thundered in syllogisms. He also thought in conic sections, squares and roots. Euclid's elements literally reproduced his geometrizing. He made Kepler's laws for the planets to follow; he made velocity to increase proportionally to the time in falling bodies. In short, there is an eternal and unchangeable reason reverberating in Barbara and Celarent, and the laws of nature are exact duplicates of prehuman archetypes buried in the structure of things, to which the spark of divinity hidden in our intellect enables us to penetrate: the anatomy of the world is logical.<sup>17</sup>

But sciences developed farther, bringing an enormously rapid multiplication of theories, so that finally we became accustomed to the notion that no theory is absolutely a transcript of reality. There are so many logics that the notion that even the truest formula may be a human device and not a literal transcript has dawned upon us. They are a man-made language, conceptual shorthand, true as far as they go and are useful, but no farther. Human arbitrariness has driven divine necessity from logic.<sup>18</sup>

Thus the extrinsic concept of law is substituted for the intrinsic mutual relation of phenomena. In other words, no universal *denknotwendige Urteile* are to be admitted; at most we may arrive at empirically universal judgments: we observe that in the past certain phenomena have invariably followed each other, and we conclude thence that they will continue to do so in the future. In the terms of Leibnitz, there exist no *vérités de raison* but only *vérités de fait*. Experience, not reason, becomes the ultimate criterion.

This is also precisely Mill's attitude toward the problem of Universals. He, too, contends that they are mere experimental truths, with no validity transcending experience. They are inductive truths resting upon the evidence of sense.<sup>19</sup> Wit-

<sup>17</sup> Pragmatism, pp. 55-57.

<sup>18</sup> Pragmatism, p. 57.

<sup>19</sup> Logic, p. 168.

ness Mill's energetic answer to those who object that it is not experience which proves an ideal truth, but that this truth is apperceived *à priori* the very moment we apprehend the meaning of the proposition—without any necessity of certifying it by repeated trials. The example objected was the axiom that two straight lines cannot inclose a space.

“They cannot, however, but allow that the truth of the axiom, Two straight lines cannot inclose a space, even if evident independently of experience, is also evident from experience. Whether the axiom needs confirmation or not, it receives configuration in almost every instant of our lives; since we cannot look at any two straight lines which intersect one another, without seeing that from that point they continue to diverge more and more. Experimental proof crowds in upon us in such endless profusion, and without one instance in which there can be even a suspicion of an exception to the rule, that we should soon have a stronger ground for believing the axiom, even on an experimental truth, than we have for almost any of the general truths which we confessedly learn from the evidence of our senses. Independently of *à priori* evidence, we should certainly believe it with an intensity of conviction far greater than we accord to any ordinary physical truth: and this, too, at a time of life much earlier than that from which we date almost any part of our acquired knowledge, and much too early to admit of our retaining any recollection of the history of our intellectual operations of that period. Where then is the necessity for assuming that our recognition of these truths has a different origin from the rest of our knowledge, when its existence is perfectly accounted for by supposing its origin to be the same? When the causes which produce belief in all other circumstances, exist in this instance, and in a degree of strength as much superior to that which exists in other cases, as the intensity of the belief itself is superior.”<sup>20</sup>

Under a differently arrayed form we have here again the fundamental dogma of the psychologists that the question concerning the origin of knowledge is purely a psychologico-genetic

<sup>20</sup> Examination, p. 154.

one, to be formulated: How does man arrive at his knowledge? There exists only one source and standard of knowledge: experimental induction. The soul is a virgin page at its birth; knowledge enters therein by sense-perception and observation. Now, since it has experience for its only source, its validity can never go beyond that experience. Consequently no ulterior logico-epistemological considerations are to be admitted, such as: What is the origin of knowledge with regard to its intrinsic validity? or, as Kant expressed it, if we are to believe Riehl's interpretation: "Diese Begriffe moegen uns beiwohnen, woher sie wollen (die Frage ist) woher nehmen wir die Verknuepfung derselben?"<sup>21</sup>

However, the believers in transcendental logic still insist that experience can observe and record only what has happened, but that she cannot find, in any case, or in any accumulation of cases, any reason for what must happen. She may see objects side by side, but she cannot see a reason why they must ever be side by side. She finds certain events to occur in succession, but the succession supplies in its occurrence no reason for its recurrence. She contemplates external objects; but she cannot detect any internal bond which indissolubly connects the future with the past, the possible with the real. Whereas necessary, universal truths are those in which we not only learn that the proposition is true, but see that it must be true; in which we cannot, even by an effort of imagination, or in supposition, conceive the reverse of that which is asserted.

How do Mill and James answer this final appeal to the intrinsic inconceivableness of the reverse of any proposition as a witness against the experimental origin of our conviction? Mill responds by exhorting us to study the elementary laws of association, "being convinced that nothing more is requisite than a moderate familiarity with those laws, to dispel the illusion which ascribes a peculiar necessity to our earliest instructions from experience, and measures the possibilities of things in themselves by the human capacity of conceiving them."<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Alois Riehl, *Logik und Erkenntnistheorie, Systematische Philosophie, in Kultur der Gegenwart*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 90.

<sup>22</sup> *Logic*, p. 160.

These laws of association the author defines as follows: (a) Similar phenomena tend to be thought of together; (b) Phenomena which have either been experienced or conceived in close contiguity (in simultaneity or immediate succession) to one another, tend to be thought of together; (c) When two phenomena have been very often experienced in conjunction, and have not, in any single instance, occurred separately, there is produced between them what has been called inseparable association; (d) When association has acquired this character of inseparability, things which we are unable to conceive apart, appear incapable of existing apart, and the belief we have in their co-existence, though really a product of experience, seems intuitive.<sup>23</sup>

James has no less ingenious an answer. Relations of every sort, he says, are just as integral members of the sensational flux as the terms are. Suppose the same two terms will return again, then you will necessarily perceive the same relation again, for they are matters of immediate perception. Besides, later, both terms and relations get universalized by being conceptualized and named.<sup>24</sup> The terms now become our abstract productions, and we can hence keep them invariant; we can make them timeless by decreeing that on the things we "mean" time shall exert no altering effect; that they are intentionally abstracted from every corrupting condition. But relations between invariant objects will themselves be invariant. Again, they are relations of comparison, and as such matters of direct inspection. As soon as mental objects are mentally compared, they are perceived to be either like or unlike. But once the same, always the same, under these timeless conditions. Which is as much as to say that truths concerning these man-made objects are necessary and eternal. We can change our conclusions only by changing our data first. The whole fabric of the *a priori* sciences can thus be treated as a man-made product.<sup>25</sup>

In reality this is simply begging the question, which last was

<sup>23</sup> Examination, pp. 222-223.

<sup>24</sup> A Pluralistic Universe, pp. 279-280.

<sup>25</sup> The Meaning of Truth, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1909, pp. 83-85.



precisely, whether the same sense data can ever appear in different relations from those which the intellectualist calls intrinsic, not whether we may regard them as often as we chose in a given relation. In other words, whether the same two terms must always return in the same relation within the flux of conscious experience. This, however, would, as we saw, be radically opposed to all pragmatic principles whose first canon reads that the flux of experience is epistemologically autonomous; that is, the nexus between its data is purely external.

Mill's explanation, too is in last analysis a pseudo-solution. He denies all immanent connection of ideas by explaining the necessary or intuitive principles as instances of the "inseparable association" acquired by ideas that are constantly conjoined in our experience. Still, if he desires to remain logical, he must admit that any association generated by experience, may subsequently be destroyed by experience.

What has already been said might suffice to demonstrate how James is one with Mill in denying that the laws of thought are independent of their subjective psychical experience, transcendental and absolute; and in affirming psychology to be the ultimate source and foundation of truth, thus reducing all logical laws to psychologic ones, as such relative, subjective and empirical. We will adduce, however, two more striking parallel passages which admirably and succinctly show the doctrinal agreement of these two philosophers.

Mill writes: "We need experience in order to inform us in what cases, or in what sort of cases, experience is to be relied upon. Experience must be consulted in order to learn from it under what circumstances arguments from it will be valid. We have no ulterior test to which we subject experience in general; but we make experience its own test."<sup>26</sup> Compare these words of James: "Though one part of our experiences may lean upon another part to make it what it is in any one of several aspects in which it may be considered, experience as a whole is self-containing and leans on nothing."<sup>27</sup>

In almost the very same words we find here repeated their

<sup>26</sup> *Logic*, p. 192.

<sup>27</sup> *Meaning*, p. 124.

common psychological-contention that conscious experience, being the source of all our knowledge, must likewise be the foundation of its validity: that it is the ultimate criterion of truth.

#### THE TRUTH-RELATION AND REALITY.

Common sense, scholasticism, the college-trained younger sister of common sense, as James calls her, and intellectualist philosophies in general have always upheld the correspondence theory of truth: *veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus*, which means to say, truth is a relation between an idea and an object outside or transcendent of it. More precisely, for an idea to be true the object must be "as" the idea declares it.

James readily admits that truth means agreement of our ideas with reality, but he emphatically denies that this implies the static relation of the intellectualists. For him truth is a genetic process. Pragmatism, he says, converts the absolutely empty notion of a static relation of correspondence between our minds and reality into that of a rich and active commerce between particular thoughts of ours and the great universe of other experiences in which they play their parts and have their uses.<sup>28</sup> True ideas are those we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those we cannot. The truth of an idea is hence not a stagnant property inherent in it. Truth happens to an idea. The latter becomes true, is made true by events. Its verity is in fact an event, a process, the process of its verification. Its validity is the process of its validation. And what do these words verification and validation mean? They signify certain practical consequences: the ideas lead us through acts or other ideas which they instigate to the parts of experience to which they refer. Just as in ordinary life I call that path the true one which leads me to the place I intend to reach.<sup>29</sup>

The intellectualist claims that for an idea to be true the object must be "as" the idea declares it. I, replies James,

<sup>28</sup> Pragmatism, p. 69.

<sup>29</sup> Pragmatism, pp. 201-204.

explicate this "as"-ness as meaning the idea's verifiability, maintaining that there is no meaning left in this notion of asness if no reference to the possibility of concrete working on the part of the idea is made.<sup>30</sup> The originals and prototype of truth-processes are fully verified leadings, all other forms of truth-processes are primary verifications arrested; indirect verifications passing muster for direct ones where circumstantial evidence is sufficient. Verifiability in these cases is as good as direct verification. In fact, for one truth-process completed there are a million in our lives that function in this state of nascency.<sup>31</sup> Potentiality counts for actuality.<sup>32</sup> Thus agreement turns out to be essentially an affair of leading.<sup>33</sup> The links of experience sequent upon an idea, which mediate between it and reality, form and for the pragmatist indeed are, the concrete relation of truth that may obtain between the truth and that reality.<sup>34</sup>

Such, then, is James' dynamic relation, as opposed to the static relation of the intellectualists. Instead of objective correspondence, verifiability, or the working of an idea, now becomes the fundamentum of the truth-relation. From transcendent agreement the stress is shifted to the natural result of this agreement, that is, to its verifiability. (The effect is falsely substituted for the cause, the intellectualist would retort.) The question is no longer, what is truth, but how is it arrived at; not, when is an idea true, but, when do we know it to be true.

No doubt, the intellectualist will qualify all this as mere descriptive psychology, a description of the functioning of concrete psychologic facts, and not an objective theory of truth. If James, nevertheless, presents it as a genuine epistemological theory, it is because of his purely psychological conception of the stream of consciousness. Consistent and loyal to his principles, James therefore calls his account of truth an account of truths in the plural. Truth for him is simply a collective name for verification processes.<sup>35</sup> What intellectualism calls the

<sup>30</sup> *Meaning*, p. 171.

<sup>31</sup> *Pragmatism*, pp. 206-208.

<sup>32</sup> *Meaning*, p. 164.

<sup>33</sup> *Pragmatism*, pp. 212-215.

<sup>34</sup> *Meaning*, p. 201.

<sup>35</sup> *Pragmatism*, p. 218.

truth, the inherent truth, is only the abstract name for truthfulness in act, for the fact that the ideas there do lead to the supposed reality in a way that we consider satisfactory.<sup>36</sup>

Thence results an important corollary: There exists no absolute truth. The "absolutely" true, meaning what no farther experience will ever alter, is that ideal vanishing-point toward which we imagine that all our temporary truths will some day converge. Meanwhile we have to live today by what truths we can get today, and be ready tomorrow to call it falsehood.<sup>37</sup> In other words, truth being psychologic, must ever remain subjective and relative.<sup>38</sup>

Let us return to Mill, in order to see his conception of the truth-relation. How did Mill propound his view? "Concepts, judgments and reasonings should agree with the reality of things, meaning by things the phenomena or sensible presentations, to which those mental products have reference. A concept to be rightly framed, must be a concept of something real, and must agree with the real fact which it endeavors to represent; that is, the collection of attributes composing the concept must really exist in the objects marked by the class-name, and in no other. A judgment to be rightly framed, must be a true judgment; that is, the objects judged of must really possess the attributes predicated of them."<sup>39</sup> In no case can thinking be valid unless the concepts, judgments and conclusions resulting from it are conformable to fact. We must ascend to the original sources, the presentations of experience, and examine the train of thought in relation to these."<sup>40</sup>

This definition of truth will, in the obvious meaning of the terms, find the unqualified approbation of both Kantian phe-

<sup>36</sup> Meaning, p. 202.

<sup>37</sup> Pragmatism, pp. 222-223.

<sup>38</sup> As Hermant and Van De Warle put it: "La vérité, au point de vue pragmatique, devient ainsi essentiellement dynamique et évolutive, elle ne se pose plus nulle part en tout qu' absolu, soit réalisé, soit à atteindre, car, puisque sa validité ne repose sur aucune évidence qui lui soit inhérente, elle ne peut être éternellement immuable, cf. Les Principales Theories de la Logique Contemporaine, Félix Alcan, Paris, 1909, p. 214.

<sup>39</sup> Examination, p. 455.

<sup>40</sup> Examination, p. 454.

nomenalist and critical realist; it presents a frank endorsement of the intellectualist principle: *veritas est adæquatio rei et intellectus*. Surely, it seems far from evidencing any affinity to the pragmatic notion of truth. However, it will be remembered that James, too, had admitted the agreement formula, and that the ways of intellectualism and pragmatism had only parted when the question of interpreting the formula arose. We must therefore turn to Mill's interpretation.

As we saw above, Mill holds that the problem of knowledge can only be solved by an analysis of consciousness—finding ourselves, as we do, on this side of the epistemological chasm. Conscious life, he told us, is a continued series of feelings in which the sensation of the moment (that of a house seen at a distance, for instance) is but a passing mental movement rising above a certain degree of intensity. How, then, are we to conceive the truth-relation and to interpret the agreement formula?

Speaking of the subject and object of our sensations Mill observes: "The thread of consciousness which I apprehend the sensation as a part of, is the subject of the sensation. The group of permanent possibilities of sensation to which I refer it, and which is partially realized and actualized in it, is the object of the sensation."<sup>41</sup> In other words, if I consider a sensation in its relation to some group, or some kind of group of permanent possibilities of sensation, the present existence of which is certified to me by the sensation I am at the moment feeling, I am referring it to the object of the sensation. Permanent possibilities of sensation are Mill's substitute for reality, as we shall see presently.<sup>42</sup>

According to this explanation, then, to appeal to the test of facts in order to ascertain truth, means to appeal to our permanent possibilities of sensation. Now these permanent possibilities of sensation are in themselves nothing but the sum-total of our actual and possible sentient experience itself. And this experience is essentially changeable.

<sup>41</sup> *Examination*, p. 259.

<sup>42</sup> See page 158 below.

We have come back to the above corollary of James: Truth must forever remain relative, it is entirely an "intra-experiential affair."<sup>43</sup> What is true today may be false tomorrow. We must speak of truths in the plural, not of the truth. The emphasis centres around the unstable predicate and truth thus becomes dynamic.

Compare also this strikingly similar passage of James with the words just quoted from Mill: "Truth means the relation of less fixed parts of experience (predicates) to others relatively more fixed parts (subjects), and we are not required to seek it in a relation of experience as such to anything beyond itself."<sup>44</sup>

\* \* \* \*

These last words usher in the final and supreme problem of epistemology, namely the question whether there is a transcendent reality, an extra-experimental *Ding-an-sich*, that keeps the ball of our psychic life rolling, an "absolute" that lies eternally behind all the successive determinations which human thought has made. So far we always spoke of reality as its conscious, sentient experience.

Mill's manner of solving this problem has become famous as the most logical defense of idealism. The pages he has written on this subject are still considered as classic by many. Among others the late celebrated Paulsen of Berlin makes them almost completely his own.<sup>45</sup> Mill embarks on his analysis by observing that common sense has always recognized a distinction between "the self," or ego, and a world external to it, but of which it can in some mode and measure take cognizance. The most fundamental question in philosophy must therefore be, he continues, to determine what we are able to know of these external objects, and by what evidence we know of them. How can we ever, being limited to the phenomena of our inner world, arrive at the trans-subjective? Objects, says Mill, are known to us through the senses. By those channels and not otherwise

<sup>43</sup> Meaning, p. 133.

<sup>44</sup> Meaning, p. 133.

<sup>45</sup> Friedrich Paulsen, *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, Berlin, 1906, pp. 397-406.

do we learn whatever we do learn concerning them. Without the senses we should not know nor suspect that such things existed. We know no more of what they are than the senses tell us, nor does nature afford us any means of knowing more.

But what is it that the senses tell us concerning objects? About one part of the information they give, there is no dispute. They tell us our sensations. The objects excite, or awaken in us, certain states of feeling. What we term the properties of an object are the powers it exerts of producing sensations in our consciousness.<sup>46</sup>

And here Mill parts company with realistic common sense in order to set off in his own idealistic direction. The sensations, he says, which, in common parlance, we are said to receive from objects, are not only all that we can possibly know of the objects, but are also all that we have any grounds for believing to exist. What we term an object is but a complex conception, made up by the laws of association, out of the ideas of various sensations which we are accustomed to receive simultaneously. There is nothing real in the process but these sensations. They do not, indeed, accompany or succeed one another at random; they are held together by a law, that is, they occur in fixed groups, and a fixed order of succession: but we have no evidence of anything which, not being itself a sensation, is a substratum or hidden cause of sensations. The idea of such a substratum is a purely mental creation to which we have no reason to think that there is any corresponding reality exterior to our minds.<sup>47</sup>

It is true, continues Mill, that I cannot doubt my present impression: I cannot doubt that when I perceive color or weight, I perceive them as in an object. Neither can I doubt that when I look at two fields, I perceive which of them is the farthest off. But, he explains, this reference of our sensible impressions to an external object is acquired, and though a fact of our consciousness in its present artificial state, it would have no claim to the title of consciousness generally, not having been in consciousness from the beginning.<sup>48</sup> No attempt to

<sup>46</sup> *Examination*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>47</sup> *Examination*, p. 8.

<sup>48</sup> *Examination*, p. 157.

determine what are the direct revelations of consciousness can be successful or entitled to any regard, unless preceded by an inquiry into the origin of our acquired ideas. For we have it not in our power to ascertain, by any direct process, what consciousness told us at the time when its revelations were in their pristine purity. It only offers itself to our inspection as it exists now, when those original revelations are overlaid and buried under a mountainous heap of acquired notions and perceptions.<sup>49</sup>

This leads us to Mill's central argument: Consciousness, as we saw, reveals to us our sensations, and of these latter alone we have absolute certainty. Hence, he concludes, if any mode can be pointed out in which, within the compass of possibility, the belief in matter might have been brought about, we are no longer entitled to conclude that this conviction is an original deliverance of consciousness. Now the laws of association are capable of creating this belief out of those uncontested data of consciousness. Whence results that matter is a purely subjective mental conception, to which no objective reality corresponds.<sup>50</sup> We have here an application of the law of parsimony to ontology.

Mill develops this argument at length. What is it we mean, he asks, or what is it which leads us to say, that the objects we perceive are external to us, and not a part of our own thoughts? We mean, is his answer, that there is concerned in our perceptions something which exists when we are not thinking of it; which existed before we had ever thought of it, and would exist if we were annihilated; and further, that there exist things which we never saw, touched, or otherwise perceived, and things which never have been perceived by man. This idea of something which is distinguished from our fleeting impressions by what, in Kantian language, is called perdurability, something which is fixed and the same, while our impressions vary; something which exists whether we are aware of it or not, constitutes altogether our idea of external substance. All this, affirms Mill, is but the form impressed by the known laws of

<sup>49</sup> Examination, p. 171.

<sup>50</sup> Examination, p. 172.



association,<sup>51</sup> upon the conception or notion, obtained by experience, of contingent sensations.<sup>52</sup>

Again, the conception I form of the world existing at any moment, comprises, along with the sensations I am feeling, a countless variety of possibilities of sensation: namely, the whole of those which my past observation tells me that I could, under any supposable circumstances, experience at this moment, together with an indefinite and illimitable multitude of others which thought I do not know that I could, yet it is possible that I might, experience in circumstances not known to me. These various possibilities are the important thing to me in the world. My present sensations are generally of little importance, and are moreover fugitive: the possibilities, on the contrary, are permanent, which is the character that mainly distinguishes our idea of substance or matter from our notion of sensation.<sup>53</sup>

There is still, continues Mill, another important peculiarity of these certified or guaranteed possibilities of sensation, namely, that they have reference, not to single sensations, but to sensations joined together in groups. When we think of anything as a material substance, or body, we either have had, or we think that on some given supposition we should have, not some one sensation, but a great and even an indefinite number and variety of sensations, generally belonging to different senses, but so linked together that the presence of one announces the possible presence at the very same instant of any or all of the rest.<sup>54</sup>

Moreover, in addition to fixed groups, we also recognize a fixed order in our sensations; an order of succession, which, when ascertained by observation, gives rise to the ideas of cause and effect. Our ideas of causation, power, activity, do not become connected in thought with our sensations as actual at all, save in a few physiological cases. Those ideas become connected, not with sensations, but with groups of possibilities

<sup>51</sup> For a description of the laws of association see above.

<sup>52</sup> *Examination*, p. 221.

<sup>53</sup> *Examination*, pp. 222-223.

<sup>54</sup> *Examination*, p. 223.

of sensation. Hence we speedily learn to think of nature as made up solely of these groups of possibilities, and the active force in nature as manifested in the modification of some of these by others. The sensations, though the original foundation of the whole, come to be looked upon as a sort of accident depending on us, and the possibilities as much more real than the actual sensations, nay, as the very realities of which these are only the representations, appearances, or effects.<sup>55</sup>

When this state of mind has been arrived at, concludes Mill, then, and from that time forward, we are never conscious of a present sensation without instantaneously referring it to some one of the groups of possibilities into which a sensation of that particular description enters. The whole set of sensations as possible, form a permanent background to any or more of them that are, at a given moment, actual; and the possibilities are conceived as standing to the actual sensations in the relation of a cause to its effects. Their groundwork in sensation is forgotten, and they are supposed to be intrinsically distinct from it. We can withdraw ourselves from any of our (external) sensations, or we can be withdrawn from them by some other agency. But though the sensations cease, the possibilities remain in existence; they are independent of our will, our presence, and everything which belongs to us.<sup>56</sup>

We find, too, that they belong as much to other human or sentient beings as to ourselves.<sup>57</sup> We find other people grounding their expectations and conduct upon the same permanent possibilities on which we ground ours. But we do not find them experiencing the same actual sensations. Other people do not have our sensations exactly when and as we have them: but they have our possibilities of sensation; whatever indicates a present possibility of sensations to ourselves, indicates a present possibility of similar sensations to them. This puts

<sup>55</sup> Examination, pp. 224-225.

<sup>56</sup> Examination, p. 225.

<sup>57</sup> One fails to see how Mill could, on his own chosen subjective grounds, conclude to the existence of other human beings. It is an unwarranted assumption. Concerning this and other contradictions found in his idealistic argument cf. Messer, *Einfuehrung in die Erkenntnislehre*, Leipzig, Duerr, pp. 61-70.

the final seal on our conception of the groups of possibilities as the fundamental reality in nature.<sup>58</sup>

Such, then, is, according to Mill, the origin and growth of our idea of matter, and our belief in external nature. If any one be not convinced by this argumentation, and retort with the famous Johnsonian *argumentum baculinum* of knocking a stick against the ground, or object that the idealist, like all mankind, really believes in matter, inasmuch as unless he did, he would not turn aside to save himself from running against a post, Mill will tranquilly assure him that the reliance of mankind on the real existence of visible and tangible objects, means reliance on the reality and permanence of possibilities of visible and tangible sensations, when no such sensations are actually experienced. On this belief, he says, all the practical consequences depend, and "if nobody believed in a material universe in any other sense, life would go on exactly as it does now."<sup>59</sup>

Mill designates this procedure expressly as the psychologic method. It consists in resolving consciousness into its constitutive elements and exhibiting knowledge as arising from the combination of these as ultimate data. His antithesis is "consciousness in its present artificial state," and "what is originally consciousness," and primitive consciousness as distinguished from present consciousness is the depository of its certainties. Thus Mill reverts to Berkeley's hypothesis of the sufficiency of mind, and explains matter as erroneously suggested by inseparable association of mental states.

Now it is well known that in psychology James is the opponent of the associationist principles which claim that our complex conscious states result from the fusion of mental elements (impressions), these latter being primordial, psychic atoms as it were, and the whole functioning like a sort of mental chemistry.<sup>60</sup> According to James the complete syntheses are primarily given, and only by comparative analysis do we later find their elements. Besides, over the determinist passive

<sup>58</sup> Examination, p. 226.

<sup>59</sup> Examination, p. 282.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Messer, *Empfindung und Denken*, Quelle & Meyer, Leipzig, 1908, p. 46.

discrete "impressions" of the associationists, the preponderance is given to the continuity of our mental states, and "acts" enter as teleological functions.<sup>61</sup> It will hence be interesting to examine how these different psychological views of Mill and James affect their handling of the problem of reality.

Mill, in treating this question, started from the subjective pole of the idea—reality chain, the individual with his beliefs, as the more concrete and immediately given phenomenon. He proceeded to seek how these truths are attained. James, warned as he tells us by the ways of critics, adopts different tactics.<sup>62</sup> He starts from the object-pole of the idea—reality chain, that is, he begins with the abstract notion of reality in itself. Having postulated this objective reality he asks, what makes any one's idea of it true for me as well as for him. He finds that however independent and "ejective" realities may be, we can know them only as so many objects-believed-in. To us the full nature of reality is given in the perceptual flux: reality's sense-experience and reality itself are for us identical.

Now, if realities in themselves can be for us only by being believed in, the question arises, how can we become assured of their trans-empirical existence and nature? James answers: If a man's idea leads him not only to believe that the reality is there, but to use it as the reality's temporary substitute, by letting it evoke adaptive thoughts and acts similar to those which the reality in itself would provoke, then it is true in the only intelligible sense, true through its particular consequences, true for that man.<sup>63</sup>

We have here the old pragmatic criterion. Reality exists, because its notion works satisfactorily: "Realities in themselves can be for any one only by being believed in; they are believed in only by their notions appearing true; and their notions appear true only because they work satisfactorily; satisfactorily, moreover, for the particular thinkers' purpose." <sup>64</sup>

<sup>61</sup> *Psychology, Briefer Course*, Macmillan & Co., London, ch. xi. *The Stream of Consciousness*.

<sup>62</sup> *Meaning*, p. 244.

<sup>63</sup> *Meaning*, p. 244.

<sup>64</sup> *Meaning*, p. 240.

One cannot fail to recognize the evident similarity which this argument bears to Mill's reply to the *argumentum baculinum*. With Mill a corollary, it becomes the central argument with James. Once more we have fundamental agreement: both philosophers assert that we can be sure of reality only as subjective sense experience.

However, one difference does exist. Mill has pronounced himself absolutely. For him reality is intrinsically subjective, the constitution of the world is metaphysically idealistic. James is less dogmatic. He affirms, indeed, that pragmatism can warrant<sup>65</sup> reality only as subjective sense experience; but, he adds, it does not prejudice anything as to reality's intrinsic constitution.<sup>66</sup> Maybe the trans-subjective is the truest of all beliefs.<sup>67</sup> Reality may exist distributively, just as it sensibly seems to, after all.<sup>68</sup>

#### CONCLUSION.

Looking back upon the result of our examination, we find an essential agreement between Mill and James regarding all the leading epistemological problems: both affirm the subordination of logic to psychology; both deny the existence of universals; both substitute dynamic relativity for static absolute truth; both limit our knowledge of reality to its sentient experience. Why, then, does the general physiognomy of Mill's positivism seem at first sight so different from the pragmatism of James? Perhaps the answer may be found in the following words of the latter: "If we take the whole history of philosophy, the systems reduce themselves to a few main types which, under all the technical verbiage in which the ingenious intellect of man envelops them, are just so many visions, modes of feeling the whole push, and seeing the whole drift of life, forced on one by one's total character and experience, and on the whole preferred as one's best working attitude."<sup>69</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Meaning, p. 213.

<sup>66</sup> Meaning, p. 215.

<sup>67</sup> Meaning, p. 243.

<sup>68</sup> A Pluralistic Universe, p. 328.

<sup>69</sup> A Pluralistic Universe, pp. 20-21.

Mill and James, though they agree in substance, because they are both thoroughgoing psychologists in their philosophy, differ, because they regard the same psychic phenomena from different centres of perspective. In Mill's "vision" of the stream of consciousness the law of association appears as the all-interpreter, whereas with James this role devolves on teleological evolution. Mill is a mechanical determinist, whereas James asks his criterions of truth precisely from the finalist characters of conscious life.

To resume, James followed Mill in applying psychology to the problem of knowledge, and in adopting his basic canon that the flux of conscious experience is epistemologically autonomous, admitting of no normative transcendental ideal laws. But he perceived that the formula which Mill had inductively abstracted from that flux was conceived too narrow for interpreting all the facts, and therefore he substituted his own biological conception to the law of association.

James may hence be justly said to move in Mill's orbit. As is well known, he himself gratefully acknowledges Mill as the "Father of English pragmatism" in dedicating his "Pragmatism" "to the memory of John Stuart Mill, from whom I first learned the pragmatic openness of mind, and whom my fancy likes to picture as our leader were he alive today." What Dewey said of James, is equally true of Mill: "His influence has made philosophy more hospitable to fact, more sensitive to the complex difficulties of situations, less complacently content with merely schismatic unities."<sup>70</sup> Saenger tells us that the philosophy of Mill is still exerting a living influence today, because Mill endeavored with iron consistency rather to have a method than a rounded in and closed system.<sup>71</sup> How often does not James reiterate that pragmatism is first and above all else a philosophic method?

There remains, however, the question how James arrived at applying biology to mental life. It is a matter of contempor-

<sup>70</sup> Cf. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Vol. VIII., No. 19, Sept. 15, 1910, p. 506.

<sup>71</sup> Samuel Saenger; John Stuart Mill, *Frommans Klassiker der Philosophie*, Stuttgart, Frommans Verlag, 1910, p. 68.

ary history how the scientific theory of evolution first promulgated by Darwin and Spencer, soon penetrated into the general intellectual atmosphere. No doubt, this was facilitated by the fact that criteriological problems dominate the preoccupation of the modern cultured world, as is attested by the singular phenomenon that many prominent philosophers of today started their career as scientists. Thus we owe Wundt to medicine, Ostwald to chemistry, Mach to physics, and Bergson to mathematics. Similarly James first held the chair of physiology at Harvard University. This would seem to account for the biological bent of mind which James manifests in his philosophy.

We have just said that sentiments akin to pragmatism were in the intellectual air. The fact that they were vaguely felt by many is proved by their almost synchronous independent crystallisations in the "*Philosophie de l'Action*" of Blondel, the "*Evolution Créatrice*" of Bergson, and the "*Denkoekonomie*" of Avenarius and Mach.

It will therefore be difficult to affirm any further definite doctrinal dependence of James. It is true, he acknowledges himself influenced by Charles Renouvier<sup>72</sup> and Henri Bergson.<sup>73</sup> As regards the latter, James may indeed have received confirmation in his own views from him, but it seems that at the period when he made the acquaintance of Bergson, his own philosophical personality had already been formed. Renouvier, the head of the neo-criticist school, is best known for his voluntarism in epistemology, that is, the important role he attributes to the free will in influencing our beliefs. It may be that the ideas which James developed chiefly in his "*Will to Believe*"<sup>74</sup> were to some extent influenced by the French master. We regret that we cannot here trace the possible connecting threads running between these two philosophers.

Casting a parting glance over all that has been said, it will

<sup>72</sup> *Some Problems of Philosophy*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1911, p. 165.

<sup>73</sup> *A Pluralistic Universe*, Lecture vi.

<sup>74</sup> *The Will to Believe*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1910.

not now be difficult to answer our initial question. Our examination, revealing the fundamental agreement of Mill and James, proves clearly the continuity existing between the two latest phases of English philosophy. At the same time it marks the evolution: the basic epistemological canon remains the same; but instead of its apodictic retrospective interpretation as found in the laws of association, new avenues of perspective are opened up by the teleological criterion introduced. While Mill in his solution of the problem of reality lies fixedly anchored at the antipodes of realism, James, indeed, also gravitates around the subjective pole; but the possibility is expressed that the oscillations of future experience may still some day bring pragmatism back to realism. The trans-subjective is again admitted as possibly a true belief.

If we represent by a curve the progressive effort of English philosophy to interpret experience, may we not then say that in Mill this curve reached the maximal negative distance from its realistic starting point? Already we have come back from must-be idealism to may-be realism. At any rate, the present writer, having followed from the shores of history the evolution of English philosophy since the days of Bacon, and seen each subsequent thinker driven farther toward the fathomless deep of subjective idealism, fancies he hears in the philosophy of William James the first faint song of the returning waves.

P. B. Vogt, O. F. M.



## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**Origenes Werke**, fünfter Band, "De principiis:" herausgegeben, im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, von Hofrat Prof. Dr. Paul Koetschau; in der Reihenfolge des Erscheinens der griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Band 22. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1913.

Probably the works of no other patristic writer have been so much praised, misunderstood and condemned as those of Origen. Blessed with an unusual native genius and an almost superhuman capacity for work, Origen has established in tradition a reputation as an author which none will now deny. However much we may criticize the many extravagances that are said to have crept into his writings, we cannot fail to admire the genius and productivity of the man as a writer. That he should have produced such generally good literary results as he did under what has been called the Ambrosian high-pressure system, leads one to speculate as to what the great Alexandrian might have accomplished had he been able to command adequate leisure to temper his inspiration. It is the duty of the critic, however to determine not what Origen might have written under more favorable circumstances, but what he actually wrote. To one who is at all acquainted with the problems involved, the difficulty of such a task is obvious enough. The critic is not only handicapped by the palpable disappearance of data and by the usual difficulties attending the transmission of ancient texts, but finds himself at cross-fire between the interpretations of Origen's friends on one hand and those of his enemies on the other, when he tries to determine from the actual data at hand just what Origen thought and wrote.

The editor of the volume under review finds himself in just such a position. It is the object of his work to critically reconstruct the original text of Origen's most important theological treatise, *De Principiis*; or rather to establish a text on the basis of all available textual evidence, which will equivalently represent the text as it issued from the pen of Origen himself. That the author

has succeeded so well in the face of the difficulties in the way is a tribute to the scholarship and toil which the editor marshalled to his task. The original form of the text, like that of so many other works of Origen, has long since passed away and survives only in the form of translations more or less imperfect, citations and fragments. That this is the case is all the more to be regretted in view of the fact that *De Principiis* is held to contain what the reviser terms "die gewissen Grundanschauungen des Origenes und vor allem die Verschmelzung des griechischen und christlichen Geistes, die damals in Alexandria vollzogen wurde." Almost from the beginning *De Principiis* was the object at which Origen's enemies levelled their deadliest shafts, and during the centuries that followed Origen's death, continued to be regarded as the evidence according to which the great Doctor's orthodoxy or heterodoxy was to be judged, and which eventually led to his condemnation as a heretic under Justinian.

The feature that particularly recommends the present volume is the fact that the editor not only publishes what he considers the best critical text available, but prefaces his rescension with an outline and discussion of the processes by which his reconstruction has been reached. After giving a brief summary of what is known with regard to the place of Origen, time of composition and object of Origen's work, together with a concatenation of references with regard to the manner in which the work was received by subsequent writers, the editor enters into a minute criticism of the sources whence he hopes to derive his material with which to effect his revision. The criticism circles around a comparative analysis of the "Grundschrift" of the present text, to wit, Rufinus' translation of the original Greek. The expert care with which the lacunae, interpolations and inaccurate translations in Rufinus' version are pointed out and listed cannot but arrest the attention of the reviewer, while the copious references and symbols, with which the revised text is equipped, makes it possible for the investigator to control the evidence adduced. The question might be raised, for instance, whether the reviser did not attribute a little too much importance to the extant extracts of St. Jerome's translation, when the latter stands in opposition to Rufinus' version. St. Jerome was no less Origen's enemy than Rufinus was his friend, and, while it is clear from the evidence that Rufinus in his translation did modify some of the extravagances contained in Origen's

original text, still it is not impossible that St. Jerome, despite his scholarship and good intentions, sinned a little by excess in the opposite direction. Just where the middle way between both positions is to be found is of course a matter to be determined, as far as possible, by collateral evidence. In the last analysis, however, it is largely a question of personal appreciation, and consequently there is ever a danger of mistaking subjective interpretation for a statement of objective fact. But since the editor has drawn up what he calls "eine Übersicht über die Fragmente der Hieronymus-Uebersetzung," and indicated when and to what extent these fragments disagree with the text of Rufinus, the individual "Forscher" is not entirely at the mercy of the reviser, but is put in a position to make the comparison himself. Consequently the volume in hand can be said to be, from many points of view, a real scholarly work, deserving of a place in the collection to which it has been recently added.

F. M. O'REILLY.

---

**Eusebius Werke**, Sechster Band, "Die Demonstratio Evangelica," herausgegeben, im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, von Dr. Ivan A. Heikel; in der Reihenfolge des Erscheinens der griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Band 23. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1913.

The *Demonstratio Evangelica* is not classed among the most important works of early Christian literature, and yet, as the editor remarks, is deserving of more study and consideration than it has been the custom of scholars to give to it. Written in a highly oratorical and even affected style, and given to an extreme form of allegorical interpretation in matters scriptural, the *Demonstratio* never attracted much serious attention either in our own day or in the earlier centuries, and this, despite the fact that the *Demonstratio* contains numerous items of interest for both the Church historian and the positive theologian, no less than for the student of biblical exegesis. The work is essentially an apology of Christianity against the incursions of the Jews. Despite the pompous formality of the rhetoric employed, many illuminating side-lights are thrown on the historical situation and thought of the times, as, for instance, on the persecutions of the Christians by the Jews

and on the nature of the polemics indulged in by the followers of the law. And for the student of positive theology not a little information is supplied with regard to Eusebius' views concerning "de Deo uno et trino," the personality of Christ, and the part played by the Savior in the drama of history.

The object of the present volume, like that of the others in the series, is to establish a text which will represent as closely as possible the original thought and wording of its author. Unfortunately, however, the reviewer is seriously handicapped by the limitations of his sources and by the poverty of early texts. The earliest extant manuscript, the one which the editor is obliged to adopt as the basis of his rescension, *viz.*, the Codex Parisinus 469 (P), is a parchment manuscript that goes back no further than the twelfth century. This document as well as other extant manuscripts and fragments together with their respective glosses and interpolations, are described with considerable detail in the editor's introduction. All mistakes in punctuation and orthography found in the manuscripts are corrected in the revised text, all *lapsi calami* are remedied, and all words omitted by the scribe, or written by the corrector in the margin or between the lines, are put in their proper juxtaposition. A few examples of such corrections are given in the "Einleitung," but the editor did not deem it necessary or useful to draw the reader's attention every time he saw fit to make such a change. While it is true that such a procedure, especially with regard to the corrections made in punctuation and orthography, has a distinct advantage in that the text is not overburdened with too many useless signs and references, still in those instances in which marginal or interlinear words and phrases have been incorporated into the text, and especially when the retention or rejection of these corrections would materially affect the doctrinal significance of the passages in question, it would have been better, had the reviser drawn the attention of the critic to the changes he felt justified in making. At all events, if scholarly effort on the part of the editor affords us any ground for forming a judgment, we are justified in entertaining of him the hope which he himself expresses with regard to his central source, to wit: "Conjekturen oder andere willkürliche Verbesserungen hat er nicht gemacht."

F. M. O'REILLY.

**Eusebius Werke**, Siebenter Band, "Die Chronik des Hieronymus," herausgegeben im Auftrage derselben oben erwähnten Kirchenväter-Commission, von Dr. Rudolf Helm in der Reihenfolge des Erscheinens der griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Band 24. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1913.

The seventh volume "der Eusebius Werke" contains a portion of a work which has contributed largely towards establishing Eusebius' reputation as the Christian Herodotus and the Father of Ecclesiastical History. In the "Chronography," or first part of the work, as Eusebius himself tells us in his preface, the great Doctor of Caesarea gives in summary a history of all peoples as he compiled it from the Scriptures and from the ancient historians Berosus, Manethon, Phlegon and others; and in the "Kanon Chronikos" or second part, he gives a chronological list of events that afford a birdseye view of universal history as known in his time. The fate of this all-important masterpiece has not been unlike that of so many other early writings. Of the original Greek only a few fragments have been preserved. We are largely dependent on an Armenian version for our knowledge of the first part of the work, and on St. Jerome's Latin translation for our knowledge of the second half. As might be antecedently expected it is the object of the editor of the volume under review to present the best possible critical text. In carrying out his plan in the present volume, he makes the task of the reviewer either extremely laborious or extremely simple, according as the latter interprets his function as reviewer. Apart from a register of proper names found at the end of the volume and a list of the manuscripts employed in the recension, together with a notice that variations, found in the various manuscripts with regard to the year of the events chronicled, are indicated in the inner margin of the text, and that the scribes themselves were oftentimes doubtful as to the accurate historical delineations, the editor submits nothing to review other than his reconstructed text. 'Tis true, the latter enjoys the distinction of having been published in quasi-manuscript form; and the scholarship of the reviser renders it fair to presume that the rescension has been effected only by the scrupulous application of critical methods. But unless the reviewer wishes to turn reviser himself and go through the process of collation step by step, he can not

at present writing suggest any personal criticism as to the merits of the volume under review other than to regret the failure of the editor to take his readers into his confidence and to discuss with them the problems involved in his work of rescension and the processes by means of which he arrived at his solution. Perhaps he will do this in the second volume which we are led to believe is now on its way towards completion.

F. M. O'REILLY.

---

**L'Eucharistie: La Presence Réelle et La Transsubstantiation.**

Par Mgr. Batiffol. Cinquième Edition refondue et corrigée.

1913, J. Gabalda, Paris, Rue Bonaparte, 90.

This fifth edition of Mgr. Batiffol's work on the Eucharist comes to us "recast and corrected" and bearing the Imprimatur of the Vicar-General of Paris. The first and second editions were published in 1905; the third appeared in April, 1906 and was exhausted in September, 1907. In the meantime critics were busy, the book was attacked, the "Lamentabili" was published in July, 1907, and the letter against Modernism in September, 1907. The Holy See was active against all writings savoring of error or of yielding too much to a certain historico-critical spirit which seemed to be spreading amongst Catholic writers, with an apparent diminution of respect for tradition and the *depositum fidei*. The fourth edition, drawn in fifty copies for the use of revisors only, was not given to the public. The author was not discouraged: he humbly accepted suggestions made by Roman theologians, and in the fifth edition we have a very interesting study of the Real Presence and of Transsubstantiation from the pen of one well versed in the history of the Eucharistic doctrine and firm in the faith of the Church.

Every student should be anxious to know what can be learned about the Eucharist from the earliest sources available. From these sources outsiders have drawn false conclusions, and it is against such writers in general and Jean Réville in particular (*Les Origines de l'Eucharistie*, Paris, 1908), that Mgr. Batiffol writes. Such discussions necessarily deal with the knotty problem of the development or growth of Catholic doctrine. In the earlier editions of his work the author did not distinguish with sufficient

clearness between faith in Transsubstantiation and the more apt and accurate expression of that doctrine. The faith of the church cannot change: the manner of knowing and expressing that faith may and does change. The doctrine of Transsubstantiation was always accepted in the church, although the early believers spoke and wrote of it under the name of "change" or "conversion" of bread into the body of Christ and of wine into His blood. It was in relation to the explicitness of belief in Transsubstantiation in the early Church that critics found fault with former editions of Mgr. Batiffol's work, which in its present form is acceptable to the learned Roman theologians whom the author consulted (see the *Epilogue*).

The Eucharistic doctrine is outlined in three parts of the work: The first deals with the original sources, giving the testimonies of the Evangelists, St. Paul, St. Justin, Hermas, St. Ignatius and St. Clement; the second treats of the period from St. Irenaeus to Eusebius; the third of the period from Eusebius to the Council of Ephesus (431). At the end of each period the author gives a summary of the conclusions to be drawn from the documents cited. Fidelity to tradition and the Church guided by the Holy Spirit must be the final rule and test of Christian dogma, but there is much comfort in finding our faith confirmed by documents coming down from the days of the Apostles and the first centuries of the Christian era. Whilst the study of such documents nowadays is necessary for the defense of our Christian heritage, Mgr. Batiffol's trials show that the investigations must be made with great care and in the spirit of faith and humble submission to the authority of the Church, such as he has laudably manifested.

D. J. KENNEDY, O. P.

**Eucharist and Penance, in the First Six Centuries of the Church,**  
by Gerhard Rauschen: Authorized translation from the second  
German Edition. 1913, B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a volume of positive theology dealing with the history of the Eucharist and Penance during the first six centuries of the Church. The first edition, published in 1908, was translated into Italian by G. Bonaccorsi (*L'Eucaristia e la Penitenza*, Firenze,

1909), and into French by M. Decker and E. Ricard (*L'Eucharistie et la Pénitence*, Paris, 1910), which goes to show that the work at once attracted the attention of scholars.

The French translators, whilst praising the scope of the work and adopting its conclusions in general, made some reservations on special points and arguments. Friendly and scholarly criticisms were diligently considered by the author, and the result is this second edition thoroughly revised and improved, a notable feature being the added chapter on *The frequency of, and dispositions for, Communion in the early Church*. The volume now presented in English bears the Imprimatur of the distinguished Archbishop of St. Louis. The importance of this historical study is evident from the list of subjects treated, *viz.*, on the Eucharist: The Real Presence: Transsubstantiation: The Institution of the Eucharist: The Nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass: The Canon of the Mass: The Epiclesis: Frequent Communion in the Early Church. On the Sacrament of Penance we find the following chapters: Ecclesiastical Absolution from Capital sins in the first three centuries: Public Confession: Public Penance: Auricular Confession. The book, written by a distinguished professor in the University of Bonn, is dogmatic, historical, critical and controversial.

Dr. Rauschen unhesitatingly rejects not only Protestant theories but also the interpretations of Catholic writers when they seem to yield too much to dissenters, and he is careful always to give reasons for the interpretation which he adopts. In particular he rejects several opinions advanced by Mgr. Batiffol in the first editions of his treatise on the Eucharist (see present number of the *Catholic University Bulletin*). Much value is added to the work by the alphabetical index giving the names of authors cited in the book, whether their opinions were admitted or rejected. The spirit and the result of the study are expressed best in the author's own words in the end of the chapter on Auricular Confession. "Whoever glances over what has been said in the foregoing pages must admit that, no matter how the present-day discipline may differ in appearance from that of the early days, there can be no question of any substantial modification of innovation on the part of the Church in the administration of the sacrament of penance." (Retrospect, p. 250).

Our author evidently had in mind the same rule regarding the development of doctrine as that announced by Albertus Magnus,



who wrote that whatever development or growth there may be is "potius profectus fidelis in fide quam fidei in fideli" (3, dist. 25, Art. 1. Cfr. St. Thom., 2a 2ae, Qu. 1, A. 7, C., ad 2 ad 4).

D. J. KENNEDY, O. P.

---

**The Divine Twilight**, by Rev. Cornelius Holland, S. T. L. Catholic Texts Society, Providence, R. I.

In this little book Father Holland has admirably arranged for children the interesting stories of the Old Testament, and has told them in the inspired language of Holy Scripture itself. As Monsignor Shahan tells us in the Preface, "it is a beautiful story, this story of God's dealings with the world, and children will read it with great pleasure and profit, not only once but many times." They will find an added charm in the skillful manner in which the author has caused one story to follow the other. The illustrations are well chosen, but we regret that they are so small. The size of the book and the typography are all that can be desired.

---

**Philosophia Naturalis.** By J. De La Vaissière, S. J. In two volumes. Paris, Beauchesne, 1912.

The principles of philosophy do not change; but their application must be presented in accordance with the established facts of science. This seems to have been the watch-word of De La Vaissière in his *Philosophia Naturalis* which forms two volumes of the series of the text-books on philosophy brought out by the Jesuits of Jersey College. The work comprises Cosmology and General Psychology divided into six books which treat respectively of the inorganic nature, of vegetative life, of sensitive life, of intellectual life, of man as a composite being, and of the universe. Some principles of General Metaphysics also are discussed, not consecutively, but whenever they are applied; *e. g.*, space, motion, time, and quantity are treated in the first book. The facts and the laws of the positive sciences are treated with more importance and at greater length than is usual in text-books on philosophy. Thus, for example, the first book devotes a chapter to the laws of mathe-

matics, another to the laws of geometry, another to the laws of kinematics, besides referring to facts and theories of these sciences in substantiating philosophical propositions. Disputed facts of science and opposing views of philosophers are presented in the "Annotations."

Another desirable feature is the introduction of current philosophical thought. The theories of James, Bergson, Ribot, Eucken, and others are reviewed in the relative "status opinionum." The opposing opinions are well classified when necessary, and the points of difference of agreement between modern and scholastic thought are well brought out.

The text-book has many qualities to recommend it, especially for students who are conversant with the French language. Foremost of these is its attention to the positive sciences. For, as the author remarks, without at least an elementary scientific knowledge many propositions of philosophy cannot be demonstrated; others cannot be successfully defended against modern objections; moreover, philosophy should be a higher unification of all true scientific knowledge.

O. F. KNAPKE.

---

**The Dominican Order and Convocation.** By Ernest Barker.  
Oxford University Press, New York.

The purpose of this modest, but pleasing little volume is to give some explanation, through a brief study of the Dominican Order and the English Convocation, of the development and practice of representative government which characterizes the institutional side of the thirteenth century Church.

It is strikingly observable that never before was the principle of representation so much in vogue as in the thirteenth century. The three great Councils held during the century, the two at Lyons and the fourth Lateran, have representatives in them; representation becomes a special feature of provincial synods and is a marked characteristic of the great Orders of Friars—the Dominicans and Franciscans—which have their birth at the opening of the century. It is also remarkable, and certainly more than a mere coincidence, that the same period sees representation a growing tendency of the state, in England and France especially.

What is the source of this new system of government? Whence does it come? Is the Church or the state responsible for it?

It could hardly be said with truth that representation was primarily and independently a conception of the state, even though it did appear in Spain toward the end of the twelfth century. Much more in accord with the facts it is to say, as does the present author, that the institutional development, so marked in the thirteenth century, was not a result of the action of either Church or state alone, but rather an effect of the growing policy of both. They develop side by side, and interact in their progress. However, if we note carefully the advancement of the two, the conclusion seems obvious that the Church, in England especially, and to a great extent throughout Europe, by its method of organization, its ideas, and manner of procedure, was a model for the regular parliamentary system which afterwards developed in the state.

Now the Order founded by St. Dominic at the beginning of the thirteenth century, was representative in the highest degree. Very early in the century, (1221) it is able to show the most finished model of representative government then existing. The Franciscans copy from the Dominicans their system of organization. Both are new and powerful Orders and exercise an unusual influence on the state as well as on the Church. Thus Mr. Barker sees in the statesmanship of St. Dominic, and in the perfection of the organization founded by him, a probable and a partial explanation of the representative mode of government characteristic of the thirteenth century in Church and state alike.

CHAS. J. CALLAN.

---

Dictionnaire apologetique de la Foi Catholique, sous la direction de A. d'Alès. Fascicule ix. Paris, Beauchesne, 1913.

Subscribers to the new French Apologetic Dictionary look forward with undiminished interest to the appearance of each succeeding number, and thus far even the fastidious critic need not feel disappointed. Few of the subjects treated are not of interest for the Catholic reader in America, and the careful scholarship which they display amply repays the cost of subscription.

In the present number, the Abbé Besson finishes his article on cremation in which the attitude of the Church towards this method

of disposing of the dead is shown to rest on weighty grounds of social utility as well as of religion. Under the title, *Religions of India*, are included two scholarly contributions, one by the Abbé Roussel consisting of an historical description of Brahmanism, Buddhism and Hinduism, the other, by Professor de la Vallée Poussin, dealing with the problems of the origin and growth of the Hindu religion, of its comparative worth when viewed side by side with Christianity, and of the alleged infiltrations into Christianity of Buddhist and Hindu ideas and legends. No less than twenty-eight pages are devoted to this double study.

Professor Forget gives in seven pages an historical and apologetical account of the Index for the condemnation of books hurtful to faith and morals. Father Galtier, S. J., devotes nearly seventeen pages to the subject of indulgences, treating with ability their dogmatic basis, the different forms they assumed in the course of time, the abuses that crept in and the reforms adopted for their correction. Two difficult questions are carefully handled by Father Durand, S. J., one on biblical inerrancy, the other on biblical inspiration. The treatise on baptism by the Abbé d'Alès, covering seventeen pages, is admirable for its range of information and orderly perspective. Perhaps the most interesting contribution is that of J. Guiraud on the Inquisition. Thirty-four pages are given to this important question, in which the reader cannot but admire the judicious temper as well as the great erudition of the author. His list of sources and references at the end is surprisingly full, taking up three pages.

All who are interested in Catholic pedagogy will hail with delight the important study on ecclesiastical education of the young, of which only part is contained in the present fascicule. It is the joint production of several scholars. Gaston Sortais gives the first contribution, setting forth the rights and duties of the principal agents of education, the family, the Church and the State. The second contribution, by Paul Allard, is an historical survey of Christian teaching in the Roman Empire. The third, by the Abbé Clerval, is a continuation of the history of Catholic teaching during the Middle Ages. In the fourth, F. Sagot describes the educative work of the Church in the periods of the Renaissance and Reformation. Only part of this contribution is given. The rest, together with three others, treating of education in France, will be printed in the next number.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

**The Morning Watch.** The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, proposed by F. Ignatius Dierkins, S. J. Translation edited by F. Elder Mullan, S. J. New York: Kennedy and Sons, 1913. Price \$1.50.

Father Ignatius Dierkins, who was born in Bruxelles in the year 1626 and died in Rome as assistant of the Superior General in the year 1700 is the author of the Explanations of the Spiritual Exercises, a famous work which, first published in the year 1687, has been many times reprinted. The third appendix to this work was published later in the year 1689 and contains the meditations of the Spiritual Exercises with only such development as were considered necessary. It is this last Appendix which Father Elder Mullan presents now for the first time translated into English and adapted to easy practical use.

There is certainly no need of saying anything in praise of St. Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises, a book that has been praised by so many popes, prelates, priests and laymen, a book that is said to have done more good to souls than any other book, with exception, of course, of the Holy Writ. The English edition by Father Elder Mullan is splendid in all its simplicity and most practical. He faithfully avoids all unnecessary changes and additions and makes St. Ignatius speak in his earnest yet amiable way immediately to the reader. There is no doubt that this English edition attains its aim and, as Father Elder Mullan modestly puts it, affords aspirants after the higher life, especially priests, seminarians, religious and sodalists of our Lady, a help to put before themselves in their daily meditations, thoughts which will urge them on and up in God's holy ways. The external appearance of the edition is dignified and the price moderate.

F. COELN.

---

**Archbishop Smith and the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch.** Compiled by S. T. B. With a memory of the Archbishop. Aberdeen, The University Press.

The anonymous author hidden under the initials of *Sacrae Theologiae Baccalaureus* adds to his book two appendices. The first appendix gives the English translation of the *Motu proprio* of His

Holiness Pope Pius X (Nov. 18, 1907) on the Pontifical Commission and also the decisions of that Commission to May 1st, 1910. The second appendix contains a list of Scriptural articles found in the *Dublin Review* (May, 1836--July, 1910), and *Irish Theological Quarterly* (1906-1911). Both appendices, no doubt, are of benefit to theological students. They would be of still greater benefit if the author—and this may be a modest suggestion for a possible second edition—agreed to change the first appendix into a comprehensive collection of all ecclesiastical documents having bearing on Holy Writ and to extend his research for scriptural articles to as many more reviews as possible. The danger of making the book too bulky might be avoided by omitting the treatises I-IV, which could be done easily without any serious damage. The book when shaped as just suggested will then deserve to be recommended to all that take an interest in biblical matters.

F. COELN.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul.** The Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, the Patronal Feast of the Faculty of Theology, was celebrated on Sunday, January 25, by a High Mass in the Chapel of Gibbons Hall. The sermon was preached by Very Reverend Daniel J. Kennedy, O. P.

**Mid-Year Examination.** The Mid-Year examination began Friday, January 30, and continued during the week February on 2 to February 7.

**Shahan Debating Society.** The last of the preliminary debates of the Society was held on Thursday, January 8. These debates lead up to the Prize Contest, the date of which has not yet been announced.

**Gibbons Hall.** A new spacious recreation hall has been fitted up for the use of students. It has already proved a benefit to the students' societies, and especially to the Glee Club.

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*March, 1914.*

*No. 3.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.



**J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XX.*

*March, 1914.*

*No. 3.*

---

## CONSTANTINOPLE AND CIVILIZATION.

---

Constantine the Great was in two senses the founder of a New Rome. He gave the Roman Empire a new constitution and a new capital. He began the transformation of pagan Rome into a Christian state, and he set up a Christian city on the Bosphorus to take the place of the pagan city on the Tiber. The glorious architectural creation which bears his name was the concrete symbol of the other Rome which had come into being through his reforms—political, social and religious. The city of new Rome could not have met the exigencies of the situation it was created to cope with, nor could it have long survived its creator, had not a new spirit of order, of justice and of law been infused into the decaying institutions of the old Empire. Constantinople, the New Rome, was the embodiment of the ideas of government and administration which Constantine, among the rulers of men, was the first to make effective. It was an answer to the failures of the past and a challenge to the unrevealed riddles of the future. The career of Constantine the Great brought to a close one period in universal history. With him ended the ancient world. When he made the fundamental law and principle of the Christian religion—the law of universal love and brotherhood—operative as a principle of statesmanship and politics, human affairs entered on a new stage of progress and civilization. By a strange

coincidence, the city which he established passed from the hands of the last of the Constantines when another great epoch in the affairs of men was drawing to an end. When Constantinople fell, the mediæval age, the age of faith, was already passing away.

The great and flourishing period in the history of Constantinople lies between these two dates, between the first and the last of the Constantines. It links the modern with the ancient world. Within its walls was preserved in large measure the civilization, the intellectual riches, the wisdom, the literary and artistic traditions of the ancient world. These it guarded and hoarded through long periods, when barbarism and ignorance had become almost universal. For more than a thousand years Constantinople was in fact what it has become in the language of its conquerors, "The City," the home and the citadel of an earlier civilization.

To have founded such a city was worthy of the career of Constantine the Great. His life was the culmination and solution of the political evils of the ancient world and a triumph over the difficulties which had for three centuries proved insoluble to Roman statesmanship. When Constantine, on the death of his father, Constantius Chlorus, in 306, was acclaimed Augustus by the army in Gaul, there were six claimants for the imperial purple in the Roman dominions. Galerius, Severus, Maximian, Maxentius, Constantine and Maximinus each aimed at being the head of the Roman state, each with considerable right and justice on his side and each with armies to support his claims. The works of peace were neglected, the frontiers were undefended, and in every quarter of the Empire Roman swords were turned against Roman hearts. On only one point were these rival rulers, with the exception of Constantine, agreed; they were united only in their common purpose to eradicate the Christian religion. With all the resources afforded by imperial administration, with cold-blooded implacability and untiring malignity, they hunted down the Confessors of Christ and offered them the alternative of apostasy or torture and death. Such a situation was not new. In varying forms

and with different degrees of intensity it had constantly recurred for nearly three centuries. From other causes in these three centuries the stability of the Empire was being weakened, discipline was becoming more lax and the strength and resources of the state diminishing to such a degree that final disruption and dissolution could not be long averted. Desperate as the situation was and fatal to the continued existence of Roman institutions, the danger lay not so much in the existing anarchy and disorder as in the fact that no maxim of government or administration, no known tradition of law or politics, offered any hope for remedy or redress.

The slow process of disintegration through which the Roman state was passing, and the threatened annihilation of Roman institutions, were directly traceable to two causes—the political theory on which the state rested and the political practice by which it was governed. In regard to the first of these, the Roman, like every state in antiquity, was theoretically a collectivist theocratic organization, based on a principle of extreme state absolutism, an intolerant spirit of nationalism and a regime of crushing despotism. Individual liberty was unheard of. The citizen belonged absolutely to the state. All his activities—social, intellectual and religious—were subject to the collective will of the city or nation to which he belonged. This doctrine of state control was first challenged by the followers of Christ. They dared to assert that in his relations with his Creator a man was free; that in the region of conscience the state had no competence, and that men, wherever found, because of their possession of an immortal soul and through the redemptive death of Christ, were brothers. The spread of these Christian ideas, and the attempts on the part of the Roman authorities to suppress them, make up the first three centuries of Christian history. It took Roman statesmen a long time to learn what the diffusion of Christianity meant to the Roman state or to any state based on the pagan idea of life and destiny, it took them years to discover that the Christian religion was incompatible with state absolutism, but, having discovered it, they spared no effort nor shrank from no cruelty in defense of the old spirit of domination.

The second cause of Roman decay and disorder was constitutional. It arose from the attempt to translate into practical politics this theory of state absolutism. Through a slow process of centralization all the power in the state was gradually lodged in the hands of one man, and the Emperor became the source of all law, honor and authority. Despotism must rest on force. In the Roman state force was represented by the army, and he who could count on the fidelity of the soldiers could wear the purple. The great mass of the people, especially the wealthy and influential classes at Rome, were, however, as little disposed to be governed from a camp as the soldiers were to receive orders from the palace. Had a military leader been able to withdraw the legions from the frontiers to the capital he might have dwelt in peace; but Rome's record of conquest and cruelty, the hoarded treasures of many lands in her rich cities were drawing each year increasing hordes of enemies and barbarians to her frontiers, and her only safety lay in the skill of her generals and the bravery of her troops. Emperor after Emperor was set up and cast down by one or other of the opposing factions. The Senatorial party had had its representatives in the persons of Caracalla, Elagabalus, Alexander Severus, and the Gordians. The military party triumphed when Septimius Severus, Maximinus Thrax, Decius and others ascended the throne. In all these conflicts the State was weakened, order and discipline vanished, and the enemies from outside became bolder and more insistent year by year.

Throughout the long period of anarchy and disorder between the era of the Antonines and the triumph of Constantine, only two among the Roman statesmen evolved theories of administration capable of coping, in all its phases, with the desperate situation of the Empire. Decius, a soldier trained in the camps, came to the throne in the middle of the third century. He proposed to restore Roman absolutism and to put an end to the spirit of faction and disorder by remaining in the camp himself, and providing for the execution of the affairs of government at the Capital by reviving the old office of Censor. Both projects failed. He himself was killed in battle and without

the support of arms the Censor was powerless. Faction and anarchy revived and for nearly half a century Rome was the prey of adventurers from within and of invaders from without. Another soldier Emperor, Diocletian, came to the throne towards the end of the third century. He conceived the idea of dividing the supreme authority between four rulers with co-ordinate powers, two with the title of Augustus, two with that of Cæsar. For nearly twenty years this scheme worked well in giving the Empire protection from her enemies. The government was administered not from Rome but from four frontier garrisons, Nicomedia, Sirmium, Milan and Trier. Diocletian was satisfied with having solved the question of defence, but his scheme failed in as much as it had not taken into account the maintenance of that theory of government, State absolutism, which alone was comprehensible to the pagan mind. Against his better judgment he allowed himself to be persuaded by his colleague Galerius to issue a decree of extermination against the Christians. The war of proscription and punishment against the followers of Christ was renewed with a degree of bitterness and cruelty unheard of before. How that war, had it been pursued to the end, might have resulted, can never be known. It ended because the constitutional expedient of setting up four rulers instead of one, had the fatal flaw of making no feasible provision for regular and orderly succession to the purple. Diocletian himself retired from the throne. His colleague Maximian was induced to do the same. Their withdrawal brought several candidates for the purple into the field and all the old problems presented themselves afresh with greater intensity than ever.

It was at this juncture that Constantine first appeared as an active figure in Roman politics. Through the choice and election of the soldiers he took his father's place in Gaul as Cæsar and subsequently as Augustus, and commenced the series of reforms and victories which made him sole ruler in Rome. Though the Edict of persecution against the Christians issued by Diocletian was still in force, Constantine refused to execute it in that portion of the Roman dominions subject to his juris-

diction. He was drawn more and more into the struggle between the various claimants for the purple. His first notable victory was at the Milvian Bridge near Rome (on October 28, 312) when he overwhelmed the forces of Maxentius and thus made himself practically master of the western half of the Empire. In the following spring he took a step which no ruler before him had dreamt of, a step which fundamentally changed the relation of the citizen to the State and of the individual to society. After a conference with his colleague Licinius he published at Milan early in the year 313 an "Edict of Toleration" by which the Christians were granted the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. "And," he proclaimed in the Edict, "since freedom and full liberty are granted to the Christians to observe their own religion, liberty is granted to others also who may wish to follow their own observances: it being clearly in accordance with the tranquility of our times that each one should have the liberty of choosing and worshipping whatever deity he pleases."

This Edict of Constantine was the first attempt on the part of any legislator to enact a law guaranteeing to men liberty of conscience. It was a complete renunciation of the theory that the State and its religion were one, it was the adoption of a principle first enunciated by the Founder of Christianity that there were spheres of human activity independent of State supervision and control, and as a maxim of practical politics it meant that the theory of State absolutism had been abrogated. Freedom of conscience, the separation of State and religion, the doctrine that no earthly authority should stand between the soul and God, was the cause for which the Christian martyrs and confessors had striven and suffered, and in writing this doctrine into the organic law of Rome, Constantine brought to an end the system of civilization which had prevailed in pagan antiquity, and established a new order of civilization as represented by Roman institutions on a basis distinctively Christian. Thus at one stroke he removed one of the sources of Roman decline. He gave Rome a new constitution. He borrowed from the Christians a principle for which they had so long con-

tended, and in so doing inflicted no injustice on their enemies, and conferred a lasting benefit on the State and humanity.

More than ten years elapsed before Constantine was in a position to deal with the other critical question in Roman politics, how to administer the regular affairs of the government and at the same time to provide for the defence of Rome against attacks from outside. He did not become sole ruler until after the death of his brother-in-law and colleague Licinius in 324. Then it was that the question arose of deciding from what place in the Empire the affairs of government and national protection might be most successfully administered. The old city of Rome had long ceased to be a place of strategical importance. It had ceased to furnish to the Empire soldiers or statesmen, and the manner of life of its inhabitants was repulsive to a man of Constantine's active and austere nature. He had the soldier's instinct for finding the spot which would place his enemies at the greatest disadvantage and contribute most materially to the success and prosperity of the Empire. For some time the eastern and western sections of the Empire had been drawing apart, and he naturally sought a point from which both might be controlled, some place on the border line between Europe and Asia. This locality where two continents meet was one where nature had been lavish with her gifts, and was rich in historical association and tradition. Many places could be chosen worthy to be the site for the throne of a man who was ruler of Europe and Asia. Constantine himself could not shake off the spell of classic tradition and thought of establishing the new Rome on the site of the ancient Troy. He considered the claims of Sardica with all its advantages from the soldier's point of view, but finally decided that the new Rome should rise where then stood the insignificant city of Byzantium. All who have visited Constantinople are agreed that no spot in the world is better designed by nature to be a great city and the capital of a great State. According to the story told by Strabo the city of Byzantium was founded by a colony of Greeks from Megara who, under the leadership of Byzas, were in search of a new home, and who, not knowing where to settle, consulted the Delphic oracle



and received answer to establish their State opposite to that of the Blind Men. This answer meant nothing to them until they saw the Golden Horn and what is now called Seraglio Point. Then all was clear, and they knew those who settled east of the strait must have been blind not to have chosen the European side.

The site of Byzantium, the place chosen to be the new Rome, is a promontory at the southwest point of the Bosphorus where it joins the sea of Marmora. This promontory is surrounded on three sides, by the waters of the Golden Horn, the Bosphorus and the sea of Marmora. It rises abruptly from the waves and is constantly watered by the swift current which flows from the Black sea to the south. "As truly a city of the sea as any of the maritime cities of the West, it has the advantage of being raised aloft on a line of hills, towering high above the level waters of the Bosphorus. These hills are seven in number, not like the hills of old Rome, indistinctly and confusedly, but each following each in marked and august succession—each crowned even now, and probably crowned always, by magnificent buildings (mosques now, churches then) closing in the mass of verdure which gathers round the buildings of the palace on the extreme eastern point."

The old historians like to say that Constantine was guided by a preternatural vision in selecting this place as his capital. An eagle, it is said, flying from the opposite shore, marked the spot where the new Rome was to rise, and Constantine himself traced with his spear the boundaries of the city, going on, as he said, till "He who guides me stops." Nothing in the career of Constantine offers such enduring proof of his genius as the choice of a place for the new Rome. Other great cities, Alexandria, Madrid, St. Petersburg, Berlin, owe their greatness to the ambitions of conquerors and rulers, but none of them equals the new Rome and none has exerted an influence so constant and so permanent on the affairs of mankind.

It is needless to speak of the natural and political advantages of Constantinople. It is practically situated on two continents, capable of dominating both and impregnable against attack

from either. The progress of the old Rome to power and Empire was marked by the various steps by which she became mistress of the Mediterranean. From the harbor of new Rome her fleets could be sent out along the Mediterranean and the Black sea, and her armies could penetrate with equal facility into Europe, Asia or Africa. At Constantinople the ruler was in a position to deal with both sections of the Empire, Greek and Latin, to weld together peoples different in language, race, and ideals. "Two strong and natural causes," says Gibbon, "are alleged for the perfection of the model of new Rome. The royal founder reigned over the most illustrious nations of the globe; and in the accomplishment of his designs, the power of the Romans was combined with the art and science of the Greeks."

Judging by what was accomplished, Constantine, in planning his new city, was guided by two motives: to make of it a civil and military centre commensurate with the needs and character of Rome's political greatness, and at the same time so to direct its form and organization that it would be the expression and the stronghold of her Christianized political constitution. Very little was needed to make of the spot a stronghold in the strict sense of the word. "The cataclysm which had rent Europe and Asia apart had made of the shores of the Bosphorus sheer rocky walls that defied assault. A strong wall on the land side completed this isolation. With a moderate garrison the ruler of Constantinople might scorn the forces of half the world."

To the natural and political advantages of the situation there was added all that the art, the science, the wealth and power of Rome could supply. Following the model of old Rome the city was divided into 14 quarters or wards and each was adorned with its appropriate public buildings. On the first hill which forms the point of the triangle and is bathed by the sea of Marmora, there was placed the Hippodrome, "an Olympus of bronze and marble, where the golden chariots flew before the eyes of the Emperors and the silk-clad people." Close by was the imperial palace, and the Palace of the Senators, and so with the other hills and the other quarters. They had their forums, their colonades, their palaces, their aqueducts, baths and cis-

terns. In spite of the sieges which Constantinople has endured, of the earthquakes and conflagrations from which she has suffered, some of the works of Constantine remain to the present, bearing mute witness to the glory of their founder.

No detail was overlooked which might add to the dignity or power of the new capital or contribute to the needs or the happiness of its inhabitants. Artists and engineers were summoned from all quarters of the Empire, a multitude of laborers toiled unceasingly in giving form and effect to their plans. The cities of Greece, of Asia, of Egypt, even Rome itself, were despoiled of their treasures of art and antiquity, of their statues of gods and heroes, of their trophies and their monuments. Constantinople was adorned, as St. Jerome said, by making all other cities bare. It became a great museum, and each appropriate space in the Forum, the Hippodrome or the Colonnades had its fitting artistic or historic treasure.

In two important features the city of Constantinople differed from all other cities which owed their origin to Roman genius or initiative. It had no temples and no arena for human slaughter. Only during the short period that Julian the Apostate reigned did the smoke of sacrifice ascend from pagan altars within its walls, and it never saw the brutal spectacles of the Colosseum or the amphitheatre. The city was Christian, not pagan. Instead of the statues and the obscene symbols of heathen divinities the cross was set up. The symbol of man's redemption appeared everywhere. It appeared graven on the walls or in the buildings, or raised aloft on the streets. "Indeed," says Eusebius, "so large a measure of divine love possessed the Emperor's soul that in the principal apartment of the imperial palace itself, on a vast tablet displayed in the centre of its gold-covered panelled ceiling, he caused the symbol of our Saviour's Passion to be fixed, composed of a variety of precious stones inwrought with gold. This symbol he seemed to have intended to be, as it were, the safe-guard of the Empire itself."

If Constantinople had no temples nor altars for pagan sacrifices, it had churches. All were built in the same style, but not

with the same magnificence. A description of the Church of the Holy Apostles will serve for all. "This building he carried to a vast height, and brilliantly decorated by encasing it from foundation to the roof with marble slabs of various colors. He also formed the inner roof of finely fretted work, and overlaid it throughout with gold. The external covering which protected the building from rain was of copper instead of tiles, and this, too, was splendidly and profusely adorned with gold, and reflected the sun's rays with a brilliancy which dazzled the distant beholder. The dome was entirely encompassed by a finely carved tracery, wrought in brass and gold." This was the church designated by Constantine for his last resting place. Here, too, many of the rulers of the Empire were laid, and it became in time the Westminster or the St. Denis of the Eastern Empire.

It is not necessary to speak of the manner in which Constantine provided inhabitants for the new city; of the rights, immunities and privileges he conferred on them; of the devices he employed to draw from old Rome some of its Senatorial and patrician families. In all this he succeeded. The lines of the great imperial highways and post roads were changed, and what has been true of old regarding the first Rome, was true now of the second—all roads led to Rome.

The actual time employed on the construction of the city from its inception to its dedication was six years. The work of building and construction was then by no means complete, but sufficient was accomplished to enable the founder to dedicate his new capital to the God of the Martyrs. No more appropriate dedication could be conceived. It was the courage and the constancy of the martyrs through three centuries that had finally wrung from Roman statesmanship the boon of freedom of conscience, and it was by writing this grant into the legislation of Rome that Constantine had given to the Empire peace and tranquility.

This, then, was the city of Constantine, the jewel of the Bosphorus, situated at a point where continents and different races of men meet. It was the embodiment of the new Rome which

had arisen from the decay of the old. In it were comprised the best of what the Rome of the Cæsars had stood for in the past, and much of what the Rome of the Christians promised for the future. Its foundation, its plan and its purpose were the work of one man. To have founded such a city would alone entitle any ruler to be ranked among the great, but the city was merely the complement of the constitution. When Constantine published his decree of Toleration in favor of the Christians he changed the whole current of Roman destiny, when he established his new capital he gave the principle on which that change rested a fixed abiding place, an outward symbol, and an illimitable theatre of action.

To attempt to describe how the new Rome fulfilled the purpose of its founder would be to recount the history of civilization for a thousand years. Thrones rose and fell in that time, ignorance and barbarism smothered old civilizations, wars, famine and destruction traced their fatal course, new races appeared and vanished. Europe, Asia and Africa poured swarm after swarm of invaders and destroyers into those countries around the Mediterranean basin which had been the seat of the old civilization and the centres of culture and progress. In the midst of destruction, of war, of invasion and ignorance, Constantinople retained its place inviolable and impregnable. If the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Alani, the Franks, the Vandals and the Ostrogoths possessed themselves of the flourishing cities and fair fields of Italy, Spain, Gaul and Africa, they may have dreamt but they never succeeded in possessing themselves of the city of Constantine. If these provinces and States of the old Empire were powerless before the onrush of the Teutons from the North, the power which swept the Vandal from the Mediterranean, which checked the Visigoth in Spain, and drove the Ostrogoth from Italy, was that which went forth from the city by the Bosphorus. The same generals and the same troops who won back the West to the unity of the Roman Empire, saved Europe from the swords and the civilization of the Persians. Time after time, in successive waves of invasion, new peoples appeared from the North and the East, and time after

time did they waste their forces and break their power dashing against the defenders of Constantinople. If Charles Martel broke the power of the Saracens in the West and drove the Moslems from the soil of France, it must not be forgotten that his contemporary, the third Leo, held the gate of Eastern Europe against all the forces which the Saracen power then at its height could muster. "Everyone knows about the exploit of the Frank," says Mr. Bury, "it is almost incredible how little is known of the Roman Emperor's defense of the greatest city of Christian Europe, in the quarter where the real danger lay." The same remarks might be made of the earlier siege of new Rome in the days of Constantine the Fourth, when the armies and armaments of Muaviah were driven back and the nations of the West acknowledged the greatness of the Roman Emperor.

On the Romans of Constantinople rested the task of defending Europe, and until the days of the Crusades, they defended it alone. While the Empire of the Franks was gradually emerging from the chaos of the period of the wandering of the nations, its progress to order and civilization was made possible because its people could work at peace behind the bulwark of the new Rome. If Western chivalry responded to calls of distress in going to the defense of the sacred places in Palestine, their response was not less an act of faith than the payment of a debt which had been accumulating through centuries and the partial assumption of a burden which the Eastern Empire had so long carried unaided.

Thus in all the great political events which moulded and directed the fortunes of humanity for a thousand years in the great drama when Europe and Christianity were pitted against Asia and Africa and barbarism and infidelity, Constantinople fulfilled its destiny as the protector of civilization and religion, the guardian of law, and culture. Twenty-seven different times was it besieged and only twice before it fell a victim to the Turks was it captured. Its first conquerors were the soldiers of the Cross, the warriors of the Fourth Crusade who, in defiance of the excommunication of the Pope, and forgetful of their vows, sacked and pillaged this keystone of Christian influence.

The Latin Kingdom which they set up lasted less than sixty years, and the city was won again by its rightful masters. These events prepared the way for the last and final tragedy. Nothing in the history of Constantinople is more glorious than the story of her defeat. Surrounded by enemies, forsaken by friends, invested by an overwhelming army, the small garrison fought to the death, and the last of the Constantines died sword in hand. On May 29, 1453, Constantinople passed from the Cross to the Crescent. It became the home and the capital of a new people and a new religion, and as such it remains today. It was dethroned from its place in the vanguard of progress and civilization, and bound in the iron grip of fatalism, force, stagnation and sensuality as represented by the religion of the prophet.

It is not saying too much to assert that the calamity which over-whelmed Constantinople in the fifteenth century would never have occurred had not its rulers in the fifth and sixth centuries departed from the spirit and purposes of the man who founded it. Constantine recognized the broad line of distinction between the civil and the spiritual, between the State and the Church. He proclaimed that the competence of the State did not extend to the affairs of conscience. His successors, notably Justinian, ignored the reform of Constantine and threw the world backward to the political theories of a Trajan or a Decius. The pagan ideal was revived and the Emperor came to consider himself master alike of Church and State. Cæsaro-Papism, the subjection of the Church to civil authority, laid the foundation for the final separation of the Eastern and Western branches of Christendom, and to this separation must unquestionably be attributed the fact that a successor of Mohammed now occupies the throne of the Cæsars.

It was not merely in the political sphere, however, that Constantinople was the leader and defender of Europe. Its influence was felt as much in the ecclesiastical as in the civil sphere. When the last great conflict between Christianity and Graeco-Roman paganism was fought out in the region of thought, and when the doctrines of the Christian religion were tested by the metaphysics of the Greeks, Constantinople was the centre of all

storms and controversies. It was in the city itself or within a comparatively short distance from it, that the first great oecumenical councils of the Church were held. Ever prone to find new doctrines or to question the old, the Christians of Constantinople, however, submitted to the dictation of a civil ruler in matters of conscience. Unwittingly they laid the foundation for bitter controversies among their descendants and raised up barriers which offer the most insuperable difficulties to the settlement of the eternal Balkan question.

Like all great cities and States, Constantinople had its periods of greatness and of decline. It suffered from domestic ills as well as from foreign foes, but it rendered an incalculable service to learning, to culture, and to art. In a period of universal anarchy and disorder Constantinople was the capital of a highly civilized State; it never lost the Roman tradition of order and administration, nor the Greek traditions of art and refinement. Other cities may have contributed to this result, but Constantinople was the literary and artistic as well as the civil capital of what remained of the Roman Empire. When the great memorials of the sages and the poets and the artists were suffering from the universal decay of the civil order in other portions of the world, Roman law, Greek literature, and Byzantine art were being cultivated and preserved under the protecting guidance of Constantinople. The wild-eyed fanatics who followed the successors of Mohammed out of the Arabian deserts fell under the spell of the civilization which they came to destroy, and the intellectual pre-eminence of Bagdad and Cordova are as directly traceable to the influences emanating from Constantinople as are many of the subsequent phases of the Renaissance in Western Europe. At a time when schools had disappeared from most parts of the world, and when blank ignorance had settled on the peoples who had made new nations within the bounds of the old Empire, the current of intellectual life was flowing on unbroken though diminished in Constantinople. Books, writing, painting, poetry, sculpture and architecture never ceased to be respected there. The Emperors were patrons of the arts and sciences, many of them were men of pro-



found learning, the patrons of scholars and scientists. Long before the great cathedrals of Europe were built or before the great universities were organized, Constantinople had been a centre for the diffusion of learning and enlightenment. It is no disgrace to the peoples of Western Europe that they did not earlier realize and develop their capabilities in the sphere of intellect and art, but it is very much to the undying glory of the city of Constantine that when this new thirst was awakened she had the means to satisfy it. It is not possible to estimate what part the East played in awakening the intellect of the West, but it is clear that that awakening could not have assumed the dimensions it did, had not Constantinople furnished the light and the guidance.

Nor was the influence of Constantinople in the thousand years of her supremacy confined to the political and the intellectual sphere. For many centuries the commerce of Europe was regulated from the Bosphorus. The business activities in which the merchants of Constantinople were engaged brought them into contact with nearly all the peoples of Europe. At a time when the economic sense of others had not yet awakened, and when none but the crudest and most primitive commercial relations were thought of, the coins of the Roman Emperors circulated throughout Europe.

In all, therefore, that concerns the higher things of life, the fundamentals of law, order and civilization, culture and religion, Constantinople held a place of pre-eminence for a thousand years. From that time in the fourth century when its walls rose beside the rapid waters of the Bosphorus, and when it was made the depository and guardian alike of the treasures of Greece and Rome, through a thousand years and more, Constantinople stood aloft, an organized State in the midst of disorder and anarchy, a home of culture in a sea of ignorance, a highly developed civilized community in a flood of barbarism. It maintained its place and its power by force of intellect rather than by force of arms. It was within certain restrictions the enduring embodiment of the life and purpose of Constantine.

Constantinople passed from œcumenical history when it be-

came the prey of the Turks. It gave them much but received little in return. It remains today a Christian captive in the hands of infidels. It is inconceivable that its destiny ended in the fifteenth century, and that its eleven centuries of usefulness are to be crowned with a slow death of inanition in Moslem hands. It is not without the bounds of possibility that changes may come. Constantinople is a European city. Its face is to the Orient. Its life may be renewed; it may once more be joined to the pulsing life behind, but it must have new masters. The happiness of a larger number of human beings, the fortunes of more nations, are bound up with the possession of that hilly promontory on the Bosphorus than with any spot on the habitable globe. Constantinople had its thousand years of glory, it has had its centuries of eclipse, but whether in glory or in eclipse, it remains and will remain the Gordian Knot of the world—the key to world politics.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

## THE MINIMUM WAGE.

---

### LEGISLATIVE ASPECTS.

There is now pending before the Supreme Court of Oregon a suit instituted by a paper-box manufacturer of Portland to restrain the Industrial Commission of Oregon from enforcing an order of the Commission establishing a minimum wage for women workers, and asking that the legislation be declared unconstitutional.<sup>1</sup> The lower court had denied an injunction, and the case has been brought to the Supreme Court on appeal by the plaintiff. As this is the first time that the constitutionality of minimum wage legislation has been brought before the courts of the United States, the decision in the present case will be of wide-reaching influence, and is awaited with deep interest in every part of the country. Eight other states have passed minimum wage laws which have gone into effect during the past year and similar legislation is being mooted in practically every state of the Union. Needless to say, the decision in the Oregon case will vitally affect the movement for the regulation of wages throughout the country. It is the purpose of the present article to give a brief account of the legislation in question and to set forth some of the leading principles involved.

The regulation of wages has moved slowly in this country, owing to the interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution, which guarantees that property shall not be taken without due process of law and that freedom of contract shall not be infringed. This was the issue raised when it was first proposed to limit the daily hours of work for women engaged in industrial pursuits, and it is noteworthy that it was

<sup>1</sup> In the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon. *Frank C. Stettler, Appellant, vs. Edwin V. O'Hara, Bertha Moores, and Amedee M. Smith, constituting the Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of Oregon, Respondents.*

in an Oregon case that the limitations of this constitutional guarantee were pointed out by the Supreme Court and the constitutionality of the Oregon ten-hour law for women upheld. That decision is now the law of the land, and in view of the fact that the same fundamental reasoning is appealed to in defense of minimum wage legislation, we quote here the language of Justice Brewer, who delivered the opinion in the case of *Muller v. Oregon*, to which we are referring:

“That woman’s physical structure and the performance of maternal functions place her at a disadvantage in the struggle for subsistence is obvious. This is especially true when the burdens of motherhood are upon her. Even when they are not, by abundant testimony of the medical fraternity, continuance for a long time on her feet at work, respecting this from day to day, tends to injurious effects upon the body, and, as healthy mothers are essential to vigorous offspring, the physical well-being of woman becomes an object of public interest and care in order to preserve the strength and vigor of the race.”

This was the argument which warranted the court in upholding the constitutionality of a law restricting the daily hours of work for women, even though similar legislation could not be sustained for men. Justice Brewer continued:

“The limitations which this statute places upon her contractual powers, upon her right to agree with her employer as to the time she shall labor, are not imposed solely for her benefit, but also largely for the benefit of all. Many words cannot make this plainer. The two sexes differ in structural body, in the functions to be performed by each, in the amount of physical strength, in the capacity for long continued labor, particularly when done standing, the influence of vigorous health upon the future well-being of the race, the self-reliance which enables one to assert full rights, and in the capacity to maintain the struggle for subsistence. This difference justifies a difference in legislation and upholds that which is designed to compensate for some of the burdens which rest upon her.”

It will be seen from the above citation that the limitation of the hours of men’s labor in private employment is not held by the courts to come within the exercise of governmental power, and the limitation of women’s hours of work is justified because

of the special structure and functions of woman. As we shall see, the establishment of a minimum wage scale for women in the United States will require the extension of precisely the same line of reasoning, and any attempt to make such legislation applicable to men would in all probability, at the present time, be held by our courts to be unconstitutional.

The constitutional obstacle to minimum wage legislation which exists in the United States is happily lacking in other countries. Since 1896 such legislation has been in operation in the State of Victoria, Australia, and in Great Britain since January, 1910. Some form of fixing legal minimum wages is also in operation in the other Australian states and New Zealand, and in all these cases the legislation applies equally to men and women. In Victoria, at the instance of either employers or employes, the Legislature may authorize the creation of a special wage board to fix a minimum wage for a given period. Both parties are equally represented upon such a board, and a non-partisan chairman is selected. Determinations, as the decisions of the special boards are called, if accepted by the Minister of Labor, are published in the Government Gazette and become the law for that trade. In regard to the operation of these wage boards, Victor Clark, who visited Victoria in 1903 and 1904 as a representative of the United States Department of Labor, states: "Property interests were not opposed to a statutory minimum wage. . . . The better employers rather courted some provision that freed them from the competition of the less scrupulous men of their own class."

In England, the wage boards, known as trade boards, are composed of representatives of employers and workers in equal numbers. Minimum wage orders determined by them apply to both men and women, and they may apply universally to the trade, or to any special process, or to any special class of workers, or to any special area. The act (9, *Edward VII*, chap. 22) went into effect the 1st of January, 1910, and has been applied to a large number of trades. "It is significant," says a recent writer, "that many employers welcomed the

establishment of trade boards, they confessing that it was only the stress of severe competition which caused them to give the low wages they had been paying, and arguing that if all were compelled to pay living wages none would be given an unfair advantage or placed at a disadvantage." Mr. E. F. Wise, of Toynbee Hall, London, writes in the *American Economic Review* for March, 1912: "There is every reason to be satisfied with the progress at present achieved. Already other trades are clamoring to be included. There is every indication that a weapon has been forged that will greatly diminish if it does not destroy one of the worst evils of our industrial system."

The movement for minimum wage legislation in the United States has been largely fostered by the Consumers' League. The international Conference of Consumers' League, held at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1908, outlined a definite program for the promotion of such legislation throughout the civilized world. This movement has been taken up in the various states of this country by the local Consumers' League, but it may be safely stated that its most effective impulse has come from the advocacy of Dr. John A. Ryan, of St. Paul. In May, 1911, the Legislature of Massachusetts adopted a resolution providing for the appointment by the Governor of a commission of five persons "to study the matter of the employment of women and minors and to report on the advisability of establishing a board or boards to which shall be referred inquiries as to the need and feasibility of fixing minimum rates of wages for women or minors in any industry." In the meantime, several other states became interested in this legislation, and commissions were created in California, Colorado, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Washington and Wisconsin. Of these, the first to become effective was that of Oregon, which began its operation on June 2, 1913. In Utah the Legislature proceeded on a different principle, and enacted a law fixing a flat minimum rate for experienced, adult women workers at \$1.25 a day.

The Oregon wage legislation was drafted by a special committee of the Consumers' League of Oregon, which was

appointed in July, 1912, to make a survey of the wages and conditions of work among the women employes of the state and to formulate such legislation as would seem necessary to safeguard the health and welfare of women workers. The survey committee undertook a thorough investigation under the direction of Miss Caroline J. Gleason, who published an extensive report in January, 1913, "on the wages, hours and conditions of work, and cost and standards of living of women wage-earners in Oregon, with special reference to Portland." In this report were to be found schedules showing the occupational distribution of more than 8,700 women, giving an account of their wages, their cost of living and their conditions of work. It appeared from this report that 47 per cent. of the employes in department stores, 60 per cent. in factories, 76 per cent. in laundries and 37 per cent. of general office help (not including stenographers) were receiving less than \$9 a week; whereas, it was the conclusion of the investigator that \$10 a week is the minimum on which the average self-supporting woman could live decently and keep herself in health. It was obvious from these facts that the wages of working women were being determined purely by the law of supply and demand and with little reference either to their needs or to their producing power.

It was found that the wage schedules of women workers were guarded with the utmost secrecy so that there was no uniformity of compensation based on efficiency, time of service or type of employment. Also that the hours of labor were frequently excessive and the conditions of work detrimental to the health and morals of employes. To remedy this condition as far as possible was the purpose of the bill drafted by the survey committee and enacted into a law by the Oregon Legislature.

The principle of the act creating the Industrial Welfare Commission in Oregon, as far as it applies to wages, is set forth in Section 1 in the following language: "It shall be unlawful to employ women in any occupation within the State of Oregon for wages which are inadequate to supply the necessary cost of living and to maintain them in health." Exception to this general

rule is permitted in the case of minors, learners and apprentices, and persons crippled by age or otherwise. The law requires that experienced, adult women shall receive at least a living wage.

The determination of what wages shall be considered adequate to supply the necessary cost of living devolves upon the Industrial Welfare Commission. The Commission, however, has no power or authority to fix arbitrarily the wage which shall be paid. The law provides for the calling of a conference of employers and employes, together with representatives of the public, and it is the duty of this conference to make recommendations to the Commission on the question involved. The conference is practically a board of arbitration, as both representatives of the employers and employes meet on equal footing to discuss a matter of interest to both. This method obviates the charge that the Commission might determine a wage without adequate information, for it will be to the interest of all parties in the conference to have the most thorough investigation before making recommendations.

On receiving the recommendations of such a conference the Commission reviews them and submits them to a public hearing after proper advertisement in the public press. At this public hearing all interested parties may appear before the Commission to show reason why the recommendations should or should not be made the subject of obligatory rulings. After the public hearing the Commission is authorized to reject the recommendations or to issue an order making them obligatory. Such an order goes into effect 60 days after it has been promulgated by the Commission.

Up to the present time the Commission has organized four conferences and has held public hearings on their recommendations. Three of these conferences referred to industries within the city of Portland and one to the industries in the State at large. The diversity of rulings for different occupations is in accordance with the spirit of the law which provides in Section 12 that "the Commission may make different orders when different conditions in the judgment of the conference and Com-



mission justify different recommendations." These differences are due to divergence in cost of living in different occupations and localities, and to conditions inherent in various industries which demand different rulings concerning the hours of employment.

The following orders have been issued for experienced adult women workers: First, in manufacturing establishments in Portland a minimum wage for experienced women has been fixed at \$8.64 a week; 54 hours a week are the maximum hours of employment, and a 45-minute lunch period is required. Secondly, in mercantile establishments in Portland the minimum weekly wage, for experienced adult women, has been fixed at \$9.25 a week, and the maximum hours at eight hours and 20 minutes a day and 50 hours a week. For office help in Portland the minimum wage is \$9.25 a week and the maximum hours 51 hours a week. The above rulings apply to the city of Portland only, and to the occupations stated. The minimum wage requirement is for experienced adult women, and it has been ruled that not more than a year of employment in any occupation shall be required in order to become experienced in the sense of these rulings, namely, to be entitled to the minimum wage.

On December 9 rulings were made covering practically all industries in the State at large employing women and affecting such industries in Portland as had not been regulated by the previous orders of the Commission. These rulings, which will become effective February 9, 1914, provide that the minimum wage in all occupations throughout the State for experienced adult women workers shall be \$8.25 a week; that the maximum hours shall be 54 hours a week; that the employment of women in manufacturing and mercantile establishments and laundries shall be prohibited after 8.30 p. m. of any day, and finally, that in no occupation shall more than a year's employment be required to become an experienced worker in the sense of these rulings. The minimum for inexperienced adult women workers employed at time rate is \$6 a week. The above provisions apply directly to women employed at time rate only, but indirectly affect piece rates as the act provides that the minimum piece

rate must be so fixed as to supply workers of average ordinary ability the cost of living.

The results which may fairly be expected from a conservative administration of the act governing the Industrial Welfare Commission will be: First, the improvement of the condition of a large percentage of women workers; second, the promotion of harmony between employer and employes by their being brought together on the conferences and being permitted to see each other's problems and difficulties; third, increased efficiency among the employes; fourth, the elimination of unregulated and irresponsible wage scales which provoke intense hatred and antagonism between the working class and employers; fifth, the prevention of undercutting of prices by unscrupulous competitors who make up for their low prices by their exactions on their women employes.

As noted above, the Commission established a minimum wage of \$8.64 a week (16 cents an hour for 54 hours) for women employed in manufacturing establishments in the city of Portland. Action was brought before Hon. T. J. Cleeton, of the Circuit Court of the County of Multnomah by Frank C. Stettler, a paper box manufacturer, asking a permanent restraining order against the Industrial Welfare Commission on the alleged ground that the legislative act creating the Commission is unconstitutional. Two important questions were raised: First, that the creation of a commission to determine wages was an attempt on the part of the legislature to delegate legislative power; and second, that it was in contravention of the State and Federal Constitution in that it deprives the employer of his property and his liberty to contract without due process of law. The first of these questions involves the mode of administering minimum wage legislation. As we have already noted, the State of Utah has passed an act fixing a flat minimum rate of daily wages in all industries. In fixing the rate by legislative enactment, the difficulty with which we are dealing is avoided, but the method has serious drawbacks which make it inadvisable. Among these disadvantages might be noted that the fixing of a flat minimum for all industries takes no account of diversity in the cost of living in different localities nor the fluctuation

in cost of living at different times. Foreign experience is altogether in favor of the determination of wages by boards or commissions, and of the nine American States enacting this legislation eight have adopted the commission type. Consequently the decision on the constitutionality of this mode of administration is of great importance. In considering this matter Judge Cleeton quoted the opinion rendered in a railroad commission case by Justice Moore, as follows:

"The rule is universal that as a legislative assembly exercises an authority conferred by the Constitution, it cannot delegate the power to enact laws. It may, however, direct that the application of a statute to a designated district or to a specified state of fact, shall depend upon the existence of certain conditions to be ascertained and determined in a particular manner."

Judge Cleeton held that the Legislature had fixed the standard of wages in declaring that the wages should be sufficient to supply the necessary cost of living and to maintain the workers in health, and that there was left to the Commission merely the administrative function of ascertaining the facts which, when determined and promulgated, should set in operation the statute.

In regard to the constitutionality of minimum wage legislation for women, the question resolves itself to this: Does the establishment of such a wage come within the police power of government? If it does, then the State has the power to limit the freedom of contract of women workers. The police power of the State has been set forth in broad terms by Justice Holmes. He says: "It may be said in a general way that the police power extends to all the public need. It may be put forth in aid of what may be sanctioned by usage or held by the prevailing morality or strong and preponderant opinion to be greatly and immediately necessary to the public welfare." (*Noble State Bank vs. Haskell*, 219 U. S. 104.) It is uniformly held by the courts that a woman's contractual freedom may be limited by law in regard to daily working hours. "To say that a woman shall not contract to work for less than at least a living wage is to go no farther than to say that she shall not

contract to work more than eight or ten hours, or under certain other unwholesome conditions which may affect her as the potential mother of future citizens. It is indeed much easier to trace a social connection between working for wages inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living than working more than eight or even ten hours a day." (Massachusetts Commission on Minimum Wage Boards, page 23.)

The only decision rendered by a court in the United States directly covering the question of minimum wage for women is that of Judge Cleeton, of the Circuit Court of Oregon, for Multnomah County. In his opinion in the case of the Oregon Industrial Welfare Commission already referred to, he deals with the matter in the following language:

"To make effective a law fixing maximum hours of labor it may become necessary to have a law fixing a minimum wage. The two are inseparably linked together. This is especially true in the case of the employment of women and children, for the reason that the occupations in which they may be usefully employed are necessarily limited, while the number seeking such employment is necessarily large. The two laws are necessary complements of each other and go to the same effect and to secure the same end. If the law regulating the number of hours of labor for women and minors is within the police power and constitutional, a law fixing a minimum wage is also within the police power."

The purpose of the act, continues Judge Cleeton, in limiting the maximum hours of labor and the minimum wage for women is evidently the same, viz.: to preserve and conserve their health and morals. Is the preservation and conservation of the health and morals of women workers a public concern, or is it merely a matter that concerns the individuals employed? If the enactment is for the public health, peace, morality and general welfare, it falls within the police power of the State to regulate. The complexity and intimate relations of our present-day civilization are such that there is a necessary dependency of the public welfare upon the health, morality and vigor of our women and children, when considered from physiological, sociological and moral standpoints.

"The women are and are to be the mothers of our future citizens, and when any considerable number of them are employed at wages which reduce them to beggary or denies a sufficient compensation to preserve health, the insufficiency of such wages becomes a powerful factor in determining the social, moral and physical status of the body politic, and is a matter of public concern."

After setting forth the above considerations, the Court observed that it is oftentimes difficult to determine where the boundary line should be drawn in the "twilight zone" of matters relating to the police power of the State. This zone is necessarily a widening one and must be and will be extended to new questions as they arise when those questions are dealing with public and general welfare; hence the limitation of the police power when applied to these matters, must necessarily be shifting, determined not so much by precedent as by reason and justice and the preservation of the public peace, health, morality and the general welfare.

"The statute having for its object the general welfare, it will be given a liberal construction. And considering the statute from that standpoint, it is my opinion that the regulation of the minimum wage for women and minors, as announced in the act, is within the police power of the State, and is, therefore, constitutional."

In the foregoing article we have attempted to outline only the legislative aspect of the minimum wage act. Within a month the decision of the Oregon Supreme Court on the constitutionality of the measure will probably be announced. If the decision is favorable, the writer will undertake in a subsequent article to set out for the readers of *The Bulletin* some of the economic problems involved in the practical administration of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

EDWIN V. O'HARA,  
*Chairman, Oregon Industrial Welfare Commission.*

## DRYDEN AS A PROSE WRITER.

---

In his private life and in his career as a writer, John Dryden was a many-sided man. His changes of opinion in matters political and religious have been the cause of undisguised embarrassment to more than one of his biographers, and the almost infinite variety of his writings was the most striking literary phenomenon of the second half of the seventeenth century in England. Here was truly a man who in his time played many parts.

Was there, indeed, any form of literary endeavor—with the exception of the then but slightly exploited prose romance—at which John Dryden did not try his hand? He commemorated in verse both the death of Oliver Cromwell and the accession of King Charles II; he enrolled himself among the metrical chroniclers with his record of a wonder year; he wrote poetry: lyric, narrative, elegiac, didactic, satirical, controversial; he translated poetry from the Greek, the Latin, the French, the early English; he constructed or adapted upward of 30 dramas; he compiled a life of St. Francis Xavier; he did his fair share in the then popular diversion of pamphleteering; he turned out countless prologues and epilogues; he grasped every occasion to invade the field of prose criticism. Certainly, whatever else may be thought of Dryden, he is to be neither feared nor dreaded as a man of one book.

And, what is still more remarkable, the poet laureate was no mere dabbler, no tentative experimenter in literary forms; he dominated in all. The Restoration drama was a poor thing at best, but such as it was, Dryden was its leading representative. There have been more appealing "church-yard poets" in English literature, but they were not of his day and generation. Of the English satirists, who—save Swift and possibly Pope—can be mentioned in the same breath with the author of "MacFlecknoe?" And Dryden engaged in cool appreciation rather

than in gratuitous boasting when he said of his "Alexander's Feast," "Nobody has written a nobler ode, and nobody ever will."

If today much that Dryden wrote possesses only an historical interest, it is largely because the vital flame has flickered out of most of the literature of the closing years of the seventeenth century. Pope was wont to ask, "Who now reads Cowley?" With no less pertinence may come the query, "Who now reads Waller, Congreve, Butler, Farquhar, Wycherley, Vanbrugh, Shadwell, Buckingham?" There exists just now a mild-mannered cult of the diarists Evelyn and Pepys, and Locke is of interest to students of philosophy; but with the exception of Herick, who was not indigenous to the period and ranked himself a member of the Jonsonian "tribe of Ben," John Dryden is the only Restoration writer who still possesses a distinct and appreciable literary appeal. To the more discerning general reader, he is the author of a matchless ode; to the more superficial, he is only a name, but ever a name to conjure with.

In his own day Dryden, though distinguished in many fields, was held in highest esteem as a dramatist—a fact which reflects sadly enough upon both the decency and the discernment of the period; in the eighteenth century he was held in highest regard as the father of the heroic couplet and the master satirist in verse; and today attention has shifted to his prefaces and dedications which constitute a considerable body of literary and dramatic criticism and exemplify a great advance in the development of English prose. Dr. Johnson voiced the eighteenth century opinion of Dryden when he claimed that the laureate found English poetry of brick and left it of marble; but might not we today apply the figure with more propriety to Dryden's essays? There was plenty of great poetry before Dryden; but was there before his time a corresponding development of English prose? Bacon had set a needed example of sententiousness in his essays, but the possibilities of his style were sharply limited; Ben Jonson had striven in his "Timber" and "Underwoods" to make the most of a prose form that was neither flexible nor ripe; Sidney and Milton had painfully beaten out some

purple patches, the one in his "Arcadia" and "Defense of Poesy," the latter in a few of his polemical writings. But not till we reach Dryden do we find prose that we can read with ease and satisfaction. English prose has been long reaching its fulness of perfection, but it was under Dryden that it received a stimulus and direction that were availed of by Addison, Steele, Johnson and Swift in the eighteenth century, and that made possible the triumphs of the nineteenth century essayists. Arnold makes no mistake when he designates Dryden's essays, "The first pieces of good modern English prose."

It is conceivable that in his prose essays Dryden builded better than he knew. They were for the most part occasional writings aiming as setting forth some of the principles which he carried into practice in his other literary work and tending, in many instances successfully, to forestall unfriendly criticism of his plays and translations. Indeed, no adequate estimate of Dryden's essays can be made without a realization of the conditions under which they were written. In their entirety they constitute his literary apologia. They were not written in the aloofness of spirit characteristic of the professional critic and student of other men's books, but with the directness and unction of the versatile and successful writer who has tested his theories in books of his own and seeks to explain and defend them.

Another thing that must be taken into account in the reading of Dryden's essays is the fact that in them the author was less consciously literary than in his plays and poems. Thus it is that we learn more about Dryden the man from the essays than we do from the vast bulk of his other works. They are really open letters, devoid of the self-importance and the ludicrous sense of universal responsibility that characterize the modern letter to the press. It is not altogether fanciful to say that in his essays Dryden drops both his dramatist's buskin and his laureate's bays and assumes in their place something of the attitude of a wise and genial teacher who rambles occasionally in his lectures, who will now and then have his little joke, who smilingly admits the direction of his intellectual bias and who



feels so sure of himself and his audience that he can take liberties even with the immortals. Some readers of Dryden have been shocked at the things he says about Virgil and Shakespeare. They seemingly are unaware that Dryden's criticisms are frequently rendered in the spirit of friendly annoyance in which Stevenson said of Sir Walter Scott: "He was undoubtedly slovenly. He makes me long to box his ears—God bless him!"

Then, too, we must remember the influences that affected both his critical theories and his style. The ancient classics were still on their pedestal when Dryden studied them at Cambridge, and their impress lies on almost every page of the essays. The Restoration period was frankly a period of French imitation when French poets, dramatists and critics were quoted approvingly and imitated sedulously across the channel. And when we recall that among the French writers of the period were such men as Pascal, Bossuet and Fenelon, Corneille, Racine and Molière, Bossu, Rapin and Boileau, it is not difficult to understand how profoundly they affected the English dramatists and critics. Those censors of John Dryden who maintain that he was unduly influenced by Latin models and Gallican opinions would do well to take into account the literary fashions of the times in which he lived and wrote.

And they would do well also to bear in mind that Dryden was a professional writer. Whatever else his Protean accomplishments did for him, they gave him an outlook invaluable for a critic. If he set down in his essays his opinions concerning the question of rime versus blank verse in the drama, he wrote, not merely as one who had read plays in both styles, but as a practical dramatist who had made ample experiments in the one and in the other. If, as in his "Essay of Dramatic Poesy," he sought to justify the alternation of comic and tragic scenes, he merited a respectful hearing because he had not only read his Shakespeare and his Jonson, and his Beaumont and Fletcher, but had tried his hand at the union of the light and the serious in plays of his own. Theorize as we will, we are so constituted that we give more attention to the views of the worker who has carried his principles into practice than to those of the lofty

critic who dwells in a cloud apart and who contents himself with oracular utterances which he is probably unable specifically to apply. What makes Dryden's criticism so valuable is that it is criticism from the craftsman's point of view; directly or indirectly, most of it is self-criticism.

As adequate as a summary can be is Dr. Johnson's dictum concerning Dryden's essays: "The criticism of a poet; not a dull collection of theorems, nor a crude detection of faults, which perhaps the censor was not able to have committed; but a gay and vigorous dissertation, where delight is mingled with instruction." And even more definitely Professor Saintsbury writes: "The great value of that criticism consists in its extremely appreciative character, and in its constant connexion with the poet's own constructive work. There is much in it which might seem to expose Dryden to the charge of inconsistency. But the truth is, that his literary opinions were in a perpetual state of progress, and therefore of apparent flux. Sometimes he wrote with defective knowledge, sometimes, though not often, without thinking the subject out, sometimes (and this very often) with a certain one-sidedness of view having reference rather to the bearing of the point on experiments he was then trying or about to try, than to any more abstract considerations."

The charge of inconsistency mentioned by Professor Saintsbury has been frequently leveled against Dryden. It assumes two forms: In the first place, it is contended that he often contradicts himself; that what he censures in one essay he commends in another; that his critical standards shift and veer. And, secondly, Dryden is added to the lengthy list of the victims of the deadly *argumentum ad hominem*. We are told that he sets forth certain principles in his essays and then grossly and unblushingly violates them in his plays; that, in short, he fails to practice his own preachments.

In answer to the first charge of inconsistency, Professor Saintsbury hints at an eminently sensible explanation. The essays were written at intervals during a period comprising nearly forty years. Is it to be expected that a man engaged in

active and varied literary work should never change his mind in the course of a life-time? Surely we do not suppose that Dryden as a man in his thirties should possess the fulness of knowledge and the perfection of technical skill that characterized the Dryden enthroned at Will's coffee-house. A rapid reading of the essays in the order in which they were written will show that Professor Saintsbury is right in saying that "his literary opinions were in a perpetual state of progress"; and since we have neither an infallible literary Church nor a literary Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, there is every reason why a man's literary opinions should be characterized by a state of flux, real or apparent.

In some cases, it is true, Dryden did not carry out in practice the theories of poetry and the drama enunciated in his essays; in other words, to borrow a significant phrase from Browning, his reach exceeded his grasp. But is not this the case with every writer who has any theories of his art? Is it not a fact of human experience that good indeed are the divines that follow their own instructions to the letter? And if Dryden failed in some instances to carry out his own ideas of what literary craftsmanship should be, there is abundance of proof that in other instances he realized in his poems and dramas the ideals he had set for himself in his essays. Besides, it is hardly fair to examine a play of one period in the light of principles held by its author at another period. Yet this is what is frequently done by writers who seek to find Dryden guilty of inconsistency. They will, for instance, take the "Essay of Dramatic Poesy," written in 1668, wherein there is a strong defence of the use of rime in tragedies, and contrast Dryden's theory as therein set forth with his practice in the drama, "All for Love," written in blank verse some ten years later. Verily, if consistency be sauce for the playwriting goose, it should be sauce likewise for the critical ganders!

The charge of inconsistency in both its phases ceases to bear much weight when we examine the stages in Dryden's development as a literary dictator. Dryden changed his opinions many times, but they were never meaningless changes. During the

forty years of his active life as a writer, his critical ideas were evolving into a system—a system that he had to formulate for himself through many backslidings and followings after false gods and explorations of blind alleys. His earlier essays are unmethodical and tentative; he feels in a vague and general way that some principles of dramatic construction exist, but he seems unable to formulate them, and besides manifests a youthful impatience of formulas. Next, in such essays as the preface to “An Evening’s Love” and “The Dramatic Poetry of the Last Age,” he places undue emphasis on the mechanical aspects of poetry, makes a strong plea in favor of rime, and indulges in a rather patronizing attitude toward the Elizabethan dramatists, who were more intent on the matter of which they wrote than the manner in which they wrote it. The preface to “The State of Innocence,” “‘Antony and Cleopatra’ and the Art of Tragedy” and the preface to “Troilus and Cressida” reveal a tacit repudiation of the more extreme theories of his earlier period, less attention to the externals of literature and the formulation of several original principles of dramatic construction. From now on his development is straightforward, and whatever changes appear are changes incidental to progress in the direction of a definite goal. Thus, in his essays, “Virgil and the *Æneid*” and “On Translating the Poets,” and, in general, in the essays written during the last ten years of his life, he gives voice to his finest and ripest theories of criticism and to what Bohn has happily styled “a deep and humanized classicism.” In them are found his sanest criticisms of books and life presented in his richest prose style.

In his Leipzig dissertation on “Dryden’s Dramatic Theory and Praxis,” Mr. G. S. Collins states that the conclusions expressed in the essays “have been almost without influence on the contemporary or later dramatic productions.” In its narrower meaning this is true, as it is true of all dramatic criticism, for dramatic criticism considered in its relation to the minutiae of dramatic construction is descriptive rather than directive. In our own day, the most successful dramatic critics are Chanticleers who happen upon the right moment for crowing

and fancy they are responsible for the sunrise. But in the larger sense, in the sense of criticism of books and plays in their relation to life and of the nature and functions of criticism, Dryden's essays do not permit of such summary dismissal as Mr. Collins would accord them. A survey of some of the characteristics of Dryden's criticism will show that the Restoration dictator formulated principles which have ever since influenced both the theory and the practice of the dramatist's art.

Dryden was the first English critic to introduce the inductive method into dramatic criticism. In this respect he was not only ahead of his age, but ahead of the age of Dr. Johnson. With a deep and abiding respect for the canons of the ancients, and with a realization of the advantages of the "unities" so beloved of the French critics, Dryden did not hesitate to affirm the possibility of development in the drama nor to recognize the merit of plays written in violation of long established rules. He was by no means an impressionist, and would, we may be assured, have slight patience with those present-day critics who act on the principle of the young lady in the art gallery who said: "I don't know anything about art, but I know what I like"; but, on the other hand, he did not arm himself with the rule-of-thumb criteria employed by Ben Jonson in the period that preceded him and by Dr. Johnson in the period that followed. His learning, his craftsmanship and his sterling good sense taught him that the last word anent the principles of poetry and the drama had been uttered by neither Aristotle nor Horace nor Boileau.

All this is merely another way of saying that Dryden was no respecter of persons, even classical persons. His fearlessness and independence have an almost bumptious quality and would be really offensive were they not supported by sound reasoning and an imposing array of pertinent facts. Thus, in condemning the pseudo-classical bombast of the speech of the First Player in "Hamlet"—a speech which, by the way, he is careful to assure us that Shakespeare did not write—Dryden demolishes "the mobled queen" in his best satirical vein:

"What a pudder is here kept in raising the expression of

trifling thoughts! Would not a man have thought that the poet had been bound prentice to a wheelwright for his first rant? and had followed a ragman for the clout and blanket in the second? Fortune is painted on a wheel, and therefore the writer, in a rage, will have poetical justice done upon every member of that engine; after this execution, he bowls the nave down-hill, from Heaven, to the fiends (an unreasonable long mark, a man would think); 'tis well there are no solid orbs to stop it in the way, or no element of fire to consume it; but when it came to the earth it must be monstrous heavy to break ground as low as the centre. His making milch the burning eyes of heaven was a pretty tolerable flight, too, and I think no man ever drew milk out of eyes before him; yet, to make the wonder greater, these eyes were burning." (Preface to "*Troilus and Cressida*."

This is not the utterance of a self-sufficient cad who uses poetry as a stalking-horse for his wit, but an expression of the contempt for tawdry and tinsel felt by a man who knew and enjoyed real poetry. Dryden's common sense rebelled at *Hecuba*, and that same common sense, supported by ripe scholarship, manifested itself frequently in the essays. Thus, he reminds those who object to translations that "a thing well said will be wit in all languages." ("*Essay of Dramatic Poesy*.") Foreseeing that his avoidance of technical terms in his translation of the *Æneid* might be censured, he assures his readers that "Virgil has avoided those proprieties, because he writ not to mariners, soldiers, astronomers, gardeners, peasants, etc., but to all in general, and in particular to men and ladies of the first quality, who have been better bred than to be too nicely knowing in the terms." ("*Virgil and the Æneid*.") Presuming that he was "liable to be charged by false critics" that he Latinized too much, he says: "'Tis true that when I find an English word significant and sounding, I neither borrow from the Latin nor any other language; but, when I want at home, I must seek abroad." (*Ibid.*) In justification for his having modernized Chaucer, he urges: "If the first end of a writer be to be understood, then, as his language grows obsolete,

;

his thoughts must grow obscure. When an ancient word, for its sound and significancy, deserves to be revived, I have that reasonable veneration for antiquity to restore it. All beyond that is superstition. Words are not like landmarks, so sacred as never to be removed." ("On Translating the Poets.") It was a literary canon formulated by Dryden in his ripest years that common sense "is a rule in everything but matters of Faith and Revelation."

Scott finds the distinguishing trait of Dryden's genius "to have been the power of reasoning, and of expressing the results in appropriate language." Walter Savage Landor has called him "the Bacon of the rhyming tribe." "A considerable touch of the scholastic" is the way Professor Saintsbury describes Dryden's exceptional facility for arguing a point in matters which one school of criticism maintains are beyond the pale of argument. It is this "touch of the scholastic," united to his practical knowledge of literary technique, that makes Dryden at once so sure-footed and fearless as to be styled by the German critic, Paul Hamelius, "the great compromiser." He was neither a rigid classicist like Ben Jonson nor a rabid iconoclast like our own Bernard Shaw; he refused to align himself with any school of criticism, even the school of eclecticism. His mature judgments in literary matters are in the main sound and illuminating, because he reached them, partly by deductive reasoning and reverence for recognized authority, partly by profiting by his experience as a craftsman and by trusting to his intuitive appreciation of the best.

Another thing that Dryden contributed to English criticism was a strong personal note. His essays are the most autobiographical of his writings. His prefaces and dedications are rather too freely besprinkled with that fawning flattery of the great, which was less a distinctive trait in Dryden than a convention of the times in which he lived; but even flattery we can tolerate when it is so delightfully administered as in the postscript to his translation of the *Æneid* where he returns thanks to the patrons who "have encouraged Virgil to speak such English as I could teach him." Never do we get the impres-

sion that Dryden hands down oracular decisions from the aloofness of an impersonal Olympus. The warmth, the vigor, the attractiveness of his prose style are due in great measure to the very considerable human element that invests the essays. Dryden is never chary of the first personal pronoun, an example which was not lost on the authors of "The Spectator."

But the strongest proof of the intrinsic worth of Dryden's essays and of the influence which they have exerted on subsequent English prose is the distinct impression of modernity which they convey. Nowadays we dispute less over such matters as rime and "heroic" plays, and certain things which Dryden strained himself to demonstrate we happily take for granted; but in its essentials the body of his critical writings is surprisingly applicable to present-day conditions. "Dryden," says Professor Saintsbury, "is in every sense a modern. His list of obsolete words is insignificant, of archaic phrases more insignificant still, of obsolete constructions almost a blank. If any journalist or reviewer were to write his tomorrow's leader or his next week's article in a style absolutely modeled on Dryden, no one would notice anything strange in it, except perhaps that the English was a good deal better than usual."

If it is true that "there are passages of Dryden's satires in which every couplet has not only the force but the actual sound of a slap in the face," there are corresponding passages in the essays in which every phrase has the vigor and directness of a fist blow. Dryden was a man who did not easily take umbrage—despite a general opinion to the contrary—and he could bear with much before breaking out into active self-defense; but when he did respond to the attacks of hostile critics there was no uncertainty in his method of carrying the war, so to say, into the enemy's country. He seems to have taken to heart the advice of Polonius regarding entering into quarrels. His comments on Luke Milbourne, the "M——" of "On Translating the Poets," are, in brief compass, as effective in prose as is his famous castigation of Shadwell in verse. Now, while satire, especially this direct, slapstick satire, may not be the highest form of prose, it is certainly the most search-



ing of the writer's ability to manipulate words. A strong writer does not always triumph in pasquinades; but a weak writer cannot.

In the more mechanical aspects of prose writing, Dryden is immeasurably in advance of his times. He is the father of the paragraph in English. With him the paragraph was a unit of composition, not a mere break in the printed page; and he first brought into use what our modern textbooks of rhetoric call the topic sentence. The prolix and dawdling sentence structure which for centuries had been the heritage of English prose from its Saxon origin, Dryden shortened and recast, and he set an example of definiteness and exactness of expression.

The value of Dryden's essays as models of virile prose is in part due to their author's insistence on the study of English as English. If even today we find men, otherwise perfectly sane and consistent, who claim that the best way to learn to write living English is to write lifeless Latin, in Dryden's time the opinion that an English style had to be developed by systematic practice in English and the imitation of English models had few if any advocates. Here, too, Dryden was in his age, but not of it; his training in the classics and his acquaintance with continental literatures had not blinded him to the importance of cultivating a style in accordance with the genius of the English language. "There are many," he says, in the preface to "*Sylvæ*," "who understand Greek and Latin, and yet are ignorant of their mother-tongue. The proprieties and delicacies of the English are known to few; 'tis impossible even for a good wit to understand and practice them, without the help of a liberal education, long reading, and digesting of those few good authors we have amongst us, the knowledge of men and manners, the freedom of habitudes and conversation with the best company of both sexes, and, in short, without wearing off the rust which he contracted while he was laying in a stock of learning."

We may safely assert with Scott that "the prose of Dryden may rank with the best in the English language." Both its matter and its manner merit respectful attention. He wrote

not as one beating the air. His theories of literature have today a living interest and constitute a mass of critical material not to be found elsewhere. His style is vigorous, limpid and varied and admirably suited to every theme and every occasion; a style that is what every style ought to be—a flawless transparency through which the reader glimpses the workings of the author's mind.

Dryden's greatness as a master of prose was recognized even in the slight and narrow epoch wherein circumstances had flung him. No other Restoration writer had such devoted adherents or such unrelenting adversaries. And, in the following century, if Pope professed to have learned how to write poetry from him, the prose artists might well have paid a corresponding tribute. Repeatedly Dryden is quoted and referred to in "The Spectator," and always with deference; and so closely did the Queen Anne writers seek to follow his literary theories that he has in a way become more identified with that period than with the epoch in which he actually lived.

Since the days of Mistress Nell Gwynn and Congreve the English drama has changed; since the days of Jeremy Collier English prose has developed. Yet the influence of Dryden is far from spent. His dramatic criticism squares in its essentials with stage conditions on both sides of the Atlantic today, for it concerns itself with dramatic problems that are universal in scope. His essays as examples of English prose are as worthy of study and as effective as models as they were at the time when Dr. Johnson advised aspiring writers to devote their days and their nights to the study of Addison. Addison, in fact, is more remote from our own vigorous age than his great predecessor in the development of English prose.

BROTHER LEO, F. S. C.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

## EUGENICS: FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

---

Ever since Sir Francis Galton endeavored to show that the transmission of human qualities could be controlled by a process of selection, the movement aiming at what purports to be race-regeneration has grown steadily.<sup>1</sup> Only in the possession of some constituent elements of truth could such growth be attainable. We are prepared then to find in the so-called science of eugenics much that is in full accord with the Church's teachings. But with this content of truth there will be discovered no small admixture of error to which the Church must stand opposed.

The basic idea of eugenics is not a new one. The notion of a perfect society brought about by artificial control of parentage is one of the very original fabrics of dreamland.

In his Republic Plato would establish a complete community of wives and children. The offspring of infirm parents were not to be allowed to survive while the progeny of the more fit and capable were to be given over to the care and custody of the State. It was ordained, too, that no mother should know her child as no child should know its mother. Thus was it hoped that the love and solicitude ordinarily spent upon offspring would be enlisted in what was conceived to be the higher service of the State. Somewhat modified the same plan appears in Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* as it does later in the ideal commonwealths painted by Moore, Bacon and Campanella.

As according to Engels it was Karl Marx who gave a scientific character to socialism, so we are told it was Sir Francis Galton who endowed what had been thought to be as "air-drawn" as the dagger in Macbeth with the form and method of a veritable science. Thus accepted it is defined by the Euge-

<sup>1</sup> The works in which Galton sought to establish this idea are *Hereditary Genius*, 1869; *English Men of Science*, 1874; *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, 1883; *Life History Album*, 1884; *Record of Family Faculties*, 1884; *Natural Inheritance*, 1889.

nics Education Society to be the "study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations either physically or mentally."

This definition is seen to be very comprehensive, so comprehensive indeed that it is made to cover social programs which, we are assured, have not been acceptable to some of the leaders of the movement. Particularly distasteful to these leaders, for example, is the scheme proposed by Mr. Bernard Shaw. This literary jester declares that the present institution of marriage is a hopeless obstacle to the general advancement of the race. Only when a navvy can without slight or hindrance from society marry a countess or a duke a charwoman, can we hope for the beginning of that evolution which is to usher in the day of betterment for our kind. If good breeding is to be sought, and eugenics seeks nothing else, the parents of our improved stock must, we are informed, give up the idea of looking for the companionship which all along has been looked upon as the normal condition of marriage. "Thus the son of a robust, cheerful, eupeptic British squire, with the taste and range of his class, and of a clever, imaginative, intellectual, highly civilized Jewess, might be superior to both his parents: but it is not likely that the Jewess would find the squire an interesting companion or his habits, his friends, his place and mode of life congenial to her. What we must fight for is freedom to breed the race without being hampered by the mass of irrelevant conditions implied in the institution of marriage. If our morality is attacked we carry the war into the enemy's country by reminding the public that the real objection to breeding by marriage is that marriage places no restraint on debauchery, so long as it is monogamic. Wherefore what we need is freedom for people who have never seen each other before and never intend to see one another again, to produce children under certain definite public conditions, without loss of honor."<sup>2</sup> It must be admitted that Mr. Shaw is here commendably clear.

<sup>2</sup> G. Bernard Shaw, *Sociological Papers*, 1904, p. 74-75.

But of course Dr. Saleeby and other followers of Galton are enabled, without much pain, to show that the Shavian program is not eugenic but dysgenic. That it spells not the betterment of the race but its ruin: that instead of raising to higher levels, it is a return to abyssmal depths. Even those who tell us that the original relation of the sexes was one of promiscuity will declare that according as man has moved beyond the range of beasts he has advanced to a more permanent marital union. To this he was impelled through the necessities of his offspring and hence Westermarck says that "Marriage is rooted in family rather than family in marriage."<sup>3</sup> We all know that among several species of brutes the male and female remain some time together in order to protect and nourish their young. To these creatures, therefore, apologies are owing before the eugenic doctrine of Mr. Bernard Shaw is fittingly characterized as bestial.

The protest Christian sentiment instinctively makes against such doctrines is raised against them by accredited eugenicists. And justice demands that these should be the primary sources of our information regarding the nature, purpose and methods of this social scheme. Nevertheless to register the opposition made by representative spokesmen to different programs put forward in the name of the science of good breeding is clearly quite different from allowing that such opposition is fully substantiated by the cardinal principles which these authorities would inculcate.

In his *Parenthood and Race Culture*, Dr. Saleeby, a leading disciple of Galton, has some eloquent pages on the relation of the family to eugenics. He gives to the psychical its due pre-eminence over the physical in human parenthood. The doctrine that would dissociate motherhood from the love and protection of fatherhood is sternly repudiated.<sup>4</sup> Another eugenicist

<sup>3</sup> Westermarck, Edward, *The History of Human Marriage*, London, 1891, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Caleb William Saleeby, *Parenthood and Race Culture*, Moffat Yard and Co., New York, 1909. See especially the chapters, *The Supremacy of Motherhood* and *Marriage and Materialism*.

Professor F. C. S. Schiller, of Oxford, tells us that the biological unit of human life is neither the individual nor the State, but the family.<sup>5</sup>

This is a salient truth and calls for emphasis. The menace to its realization from the State is not, however, from the extensive enlargement of the latter's functions, such as Plato saw in his dream. The idea of a State as a foundling asylum can be entertained only by doctrinaries reckless of the fact and postulates of human nature. It involves too violent an interference with an elementary force in life—the love of parent for offspring. True it is this love in the human parent is only too often an instinctive impulse uninformed by any rational process marking it off in kind from the love of the lower animal for its young. It, therefore, will often need direction and guidance. Its shortcomings will often require to be supplied. But it can never be supplanted.

The danger to the due position of the family threatened by the State is of a less extreme and definite form. Nevertheless a real danger it is. It is to be found in the comprehensive and detailed legislation regarding the nurture and upbringing of the child without sufficient address to parenthood. Such legislation would be taken up with the care and cultivation of the flower forgetful the while of the tree. The result is that the sense of parental responsibility has become generally weakened. This means that the due relation of the family to the social organism and indeed to life itself is bound to become less appreciated. In the insistence of the eugenists upon culture for parenthood, the vital fact of such relationship is at least brought to the fore. But it is particularly from this side of individualism that there comes the menace of which we are speaking. This individualism finds its present expression in more than a mere drift or tendency. It finds embodiment in a "new morality," or to use a more fitting characterization, a "new freedom." It is to be the means of a greater self-realization—a self-realization that has too long been cabined, cribbed, con-

<sup>5</sup> F. C. S. Schiller, *Eugenics and Politics*, Art. in *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1914.

finer by the forms and conventions built up by the old morality now become effete. It is to be observed that the word morality, is to be here accepted in its restricted sense as applied to the relations of sex. In other words it is in just the sphere where the greatest insurgency against the control and dominancy of reason is experienced that the restraining bars are to be let down. Such bars are those particularly that are found in monogamy. That this form of marriage represents a high advance over polygamy and polyandry the preachers of the new morality will not deny. Speaking of the good brought about by monogamy, the Swedish writer, Ellen Key, a leader in the new movement, says: <sup>6</sup>

"It minimised the struggle of the men for the women, and this economised forces for other ends, it provided an incentive to work for offspring, it developed modesty and tenderness within the sexual relationship and thus raised the position of the woman and with it her importance in the bring-up of the children, it provided them and her with a protection against the arbitrary will of the husband; through home life it fostered self-command and coöperation; the need of the two for each other led to mutual kindness. But . . . monogamy which was a custom long before the introduction of Christianity, became injurious as well as beneficial to true sexual morality, from the moment the Church prescribed it as the only form of this morality."

Another form, therefore, more conducive to race betterment is now called for. This is to be found, not only in a greater freedom to contract marital union without external form or sanction, but to break the marriage bond directly "a real union is no longer possible." And this real union becomes impossible when mutual love ceases. As soon, therefore, as either husband or wife fail to feel for each the sentiments which prompted their intermarriage, they should be severally free to break their bonds and enter into a new alliance. Nor is it necessary to wait until mutual love has passed, for "even when love is real and well-founded there yet arise, from the charm of contradictions, . . . innumerable occasions of miserable discord."<sup>7</sup> Here surely is an open door.

<sup>6</sup> Ellen Key, *Love and Marriage*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, p. 910.

<sup>7</sup> Ellen Key, *op. cit.* p. 317.

All this, it is admitted, is in clear contravention of the ordinary vows of lovers, and of the troth plighted in the marriage ceremony. But these pledges of fidelity must not be looked upon as binding in the sobering light that succeeds love's young dream. When lovers come to a finer sense of social responsibility, they will not give, much less exact, promises which they know they will be constrained to disregard if an inner necessity should develop in the future.<sup>8</sup> It is moreover a "satanic device" to seek to establish a legal institution of lasting endurance upon vows at breaking of which Jove does well to laugh."

Ellen Key, we infer, would advise that one should be off with the old love, before he might be on with the new, but even this restriction would be withdrawn by some of our new moralists. Says Mr. Walter M. Gallechan in the *English Review* for Sept., 1913:

"Under present economic conditions and the prejudice of social opinion, the penalties which women have to pay for any sexual relationship outside of marriage is too heavy. . . . I believe if there were some open recognition of these partnerships outside of marriage, not necessarily permanent, with proper provision for the woman and her children, should there be any, a provision not dependent on the generosity of the man, and made after the love which sanctioned the union had waned, but in the form of a contract before the relationship was entered upon, there would be many women ready to undertake such unions gladly. . . . It is also possible that such contracts might be made by those who were unsuitably mated and yet did not wish entirely to sever the bond between them, with some other partner they could love. Such contracts would open up possibilities of happy partnership to many."

After listening to this kind of ethics one experiences a sense of healthy reaction in hearing the sane representatives of

<sup>8</sup> Ellen Key, op. cit. p. 291.

<sup>9</sup> Ideally speaking, it is plain that anything like a perfect union must have perfect freedom for its condition; and while it is quite supposable that a lover might, out of the fulness of his heart, make promises and give pledges, it is really almost inconceivable that anyone having that delicate and proud sense which marks deep feeling, could possibly demand a promise from his loved one. As there is undoubtedly a certain natural reticence in sex, so perhaps the most decent thing in true marriage would be to say nothing—make no promises—either for a year or a lifetime. Edward Carpenter, *Love's Coming of Age*, Chicago, Alice B. Stockham and Co., p. 107.



eugenics insist upon monogamy as being the form of sex relationships possessed of survival value. This quality it has because of the protection and nurture it secures to the child. For only in the bosom of the family with its intimate life and sympathies, its continuous call for unselfishness and sacrifice, its apportionment of responsibility can the physical, affectional and moral natures of the child find the sufficient theatre for due development. Herein only is to be found the training ground for the individual direction and control upon which true growth must ever be conditioned. Palpably inconsistent therefore are the advocates of the present autonomous ethics in seeking to obtain for the parent freedom for ampler self-realization by consigning the child to conditions wherein a full and ordered unfolding of its peculiar powers is hopelessly impossible. True it is the absence of peace and love between parents offers an unpromising sanctuary and school for the upbringing of offspring, yet even in such environment as Foerster points out, the child may gain a body of experience of greater value for life than were possible from any State custodianship.<sup>10</sup>

In stating that the eugenists contend for monogamy as the only form of sex relationship of social value, we would not be understood as allowing that the principles finding general advocacy among them comport with such insistence. Indeed we must note the fatal contradiction involved in inveighing against the principles which would repudiate monogamy and at the same time upholding an institution directly subversive of this form of marriage. We refer to the institution of divorce. And here we would prescind from the teachings of positive religion regarding the permanency of the marriage-tie. We would appeal only to the postulates of Nature and her purposes upon which we can take a common footing with the eugenists. And on this ground we meet with the imperious prescription that monogamic marriage is the ordained organ for the future, that its primary end is not the betterment, the de-

<sup>10</sup> F. W. Foerster, *Marriage and the Sex Problem*, Frederick H. Stokes, New York. p. 48.

velopment of the individual, but the conservation of the race. Unhesitatingly therefore Nature lays her ax upon the root of the idea that erotic love is the prime and necessary condition of marriage. Unreservably she repudiates such an attitude as this from *The Freewoman*: "I certainly hope Freewomen will not enter upon the sex relationship for any such conscious purpose as that of reproduction, but rather that they will find in the passionate love between man and woman, even if it be transient, the only sanction for sex intimacy."<sup>11</sup> No, marriage can come by its assigned purpose, only by means of a state of comradeship,—a comradeship which the weal of the child and of the race demands shall be enduring. Only in this companionship can marriage be raised above the levels where "hog-philosophy"—to use Carlyle's phrase—would keep it. According to the testimony given in the majority report of the Divorce Commission of England, submitted last year, "No witness has been able to tell us of a country, where as the result of greater facility for the dissolution of marriage, public morality has been promoted, the ties of the family—of husband and wife, of parents and children, have been strengthened and home life has been made purer and more settled." But the strengthening of ties between husband and wife, and parents and children, the bringing to the home a higher purity and to its life a greater stability, is not the ultimate purpose of this bond but the means and condition by which this purpose becomes attainable. For in such family life is the child best furnished with the props and stays which Nature intended for the being upon which depends the future of the race.

That the ties of marriage are felt by an increasing number to be galling fetters cannot be denied. The Feminists will not let us forget that. Indeed we are told that as long as the present ethics prevail, marriage will entail for woman nothing short of serfdom. Now if it were against artificial conditions following upon economic or social ills of a contingent nature, the protests raised by our feminine individualists would inevi-

<sup>11</sup> *The Freewoman*, vol. I, p. 153 *et seq.*

tably prevail. It would then be the cry of outraged justice. But it is against nothing short of monogamy as an institution that the voice of insurgency is raised. "The ultimate aim of Feminism," says W. L. George in last December's *Atlantic Review*, "is the practical suppression of marriage and the institution of free alliance." But the inexorable purpose of Nature discovers this outcry's impotency. True it certainly is that for many individual cases the lasting ties of marriage must act as a cruel and embittering thralldom. Even in the best regulated families constant intimacy becomes oftentimes bore-some, not infrequently oppressive. But this only bears witness to the fact that Nature is so concerned with the perpetuation of the type that she would often ignore the individual, that only in the travail, often in the very death of the latter does she attain her end.

Here it has not been our purpose to demonstrate the Catholic doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage. It has been sufficient to show that the teaching of the eugenists regarding easier divorce is directly detrimental to the interests for which they have arrayed themselves as champions; that such teaching is ultimately dysgenic, that it negatives the cardinal principle conditioning all race amelioration which is that the family and not the individual is the unit of society.

In the cause of race betterment the eugenists have necessarily insisted much upon the dignity and office of motherhood. And clearly with the mother and with motherhood the dearest plans of Nature are all bound up. That growing numbers of women today shirk maternal responsibility naturally gives the eugenist serious concern. The failure to discharge this role has given rise to consequences which have been pointed out by Mr. and Mrs. Whetham in their striking book *The Family and the Nation*. According to these authors there is a gradual lessening of the social values upon which the continued welfare of the race necessarily depends. To put it otherwise the quality of the race through the pressure of circumstances generally prevailing is deteriorating, for reliable records reveal the fact that within a generation the birth-rate of the desirable members of the population of England—the upper classes, the middle

classes and the skilled artisan classes have fallen from four and a half to two. What has occurred in England we are warranted in concluding has taken place in our own country. Indeed, there is ample reason to think that the birth-rate among the corresponding portion of our people has, in the same time, shown a more marked diminution. Now it has been proved that if any class of the population is to keep up its numbers in a succeeding generation there must be four children to every one of its fertile marriages. This means that, in one generation, the more valuable members of our population, as of those in England, have become in numerical strength only one-half of what is required in order that they may be saved from extinction. When, on the other hand, we realize that the average number of offspring among the feeble-minded and weaker stocks is in England, and most probably in America, more than seven we can appreciate the concern to which we have above referred.<sup>12</sup>

Moreover, the proper care demanded by the growing number of our mentally defective population constitutes for the community an increasing burden which threatens to become unbearable. We are informed that one-seventh of the revenue of the State of New York is expended in looking after its defectives. According to Dr. Goddard, the United States is taking care of only one-tenth of its mentally defectives. Already, the opinion among our people is general; that there is over-taxation for this purpose. "It is impossible," concludes the author just quoted, "to entertain the thought of caring for ten times as many."<sup>13</sup> Here then is a condition that surely augurs ill. It would seem to spell the inevitable inundation of the sane and able by the engulfing waves of the unfit and defective members of our society. It would unmistakably inculcate upon these sane and able members the obligation of eliciting a different story from the birth-rate statistics.

But how is this to be done? Is it to be brought about by holding up the ideal of motherhood, much as Dr. Saleeby would

<sup>12</sup> Whetham, William C. and Catherine D., *The Family and the Nation*, p. 122 *et seq.*

<sup>13</sup> Henry Herbert Goddard, Ph. D., *The Kallikak Family*, p. 105.

body this forth? No doubt the picture is a charming one, even though it ceases to appeal to many of our feminists. But the trouble is that the resultant admiration of it ever remains quite distinct from the imitation it would be made to preach. The drunkard and the libertine have gone their way, not because the ideal of temperance or of purity has ceased longer to be able to win their esteem, as neither have taken their course because they were lured by the hideous mien of vice, but because there intervened between the most genuine homage to an ideal and the effort to exemplify it, the obstacles placed by indulgence, selfishness, sensuality. To these latter address must be directed if the exemplar raised aloft would become operative.

Professor Schiller sees hope in the day when the "ancestor worship of the animist can be developed into the descendant worship of the eugenist."<sup>14</sup> But a very discouraging obstacle in the way of such development is to be found in a very radical difference between ancestor worship and descendant worship. In the conviction of the animist, ancestors still live. They can exact a present accountability. But descendants are too unreal a quantity to succeed in imposing upon the ordinary citizen the same definite kind of obligation even though he might not be impelled to the Irishman's query: "What has posterity done for us?"

It is not to be denied that reason would prescribe clear social duties in these circumstances. This it does by disclosing the exactions of the law of Nature. That law we have already referred to. Yet urgent though these reasons be and clear the way they would point, they are quite insufficient. They may seem so when canvassed in the laboratory or library, but when brought to bear upon ordinary flesh and blood, it will be discovered that they fall short. This for the reason that the flesh and blood of humanity can be raised above itself only by a power not itself. It can be raised only by the force and pressure of motives and sanctions with which our eugenist does not reckon or reckons insufficiently. It is these same motives

<sup>14</sup> F. C. Schiller, "Eugenics and Politics," article in *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1914.

and sanctions which can still make the unselfishness, sacrifice and altruism demanded by race welfare again assert themselves above our fatal individualism. "The aim of eugenists," says Mr. Galton, "is to bring as many influences as can be reasonably employed to cause the useful classes in the community to contribute more than their proportion to the next generation." If the influences thus far brought by the eugenicist to this end comprehend the sum total of those from which they take their hope, we do not hesitate to affirm the prospect is not an encouraging one.

Of course we would not represent Mr. Galton and his accredited followers as ignoring or disparaging all religion. What we would maintain is that the religion they would recognize and avow is not the power whence can come the social regeneration they seek. Such religion they declare to be the "whole-hearted acceptance of eugenics . . . the thorough conviction by a nation that no worthier object exists for man than the improvement of his own race."<sup>15</sup> "I claim," says Dr. Saleeby, "that eugenics is religious, is and will ever be a religion."<sup>16</sup> The Very Rev. W. R. Inge preaches to the same effect. Religion is to find its end and aim in the eugenic good. In this alone we discover the eternal values.<sup>17</sup> This idea Dr. Saleeby would illustrate when he tells us, "If the mother and child worship which is to be found in the more modern religions, such as Christianity, is to be worth anything to the coming world, it must cease to have reference to one mother and one child only: it must hail every mother everywhere as a Madonna and every child as in some measure deity incarnate."<sup>18</sup> Without adverting

<sup>15</sup> Francis Galton, *Sociological Papers*, MacMillan, 1905, p. et seq.

<sup>16</sup> C. W. Saleeby: op. cit. p. 351.

<sup>17</sup> The worthy Dean deplores the fact that: "We do not think it wicked to encourage a beautiful and glorious specimen of womanhood to become a nun or Sister of Mercy, with vows of perpetual virginity. Here surely is a case in which the Eugenics Educational Society ought to have something to say. A man or woman belonging to a good stock ought to be told by public opinion that it is a duty to society for him or her to marry and have children."

<sup>18</sup> C. W. Saleeby, *Woman and Womanhood*, Mitchell Kennerley, New York, 1911, p. 148.

to the irreverence in the foregoing, we repeat again that the so-called religion which it describes is thoroughly impotent to bring the race up to higher levels than those upon which it now ranges. The evidence of history is sufficient regarding the uplifting worth of man-made deities. It is only by laying hold of what is above us that we can elevate ourselves. We can never do so by pulling on our boot straps.

It would be interesting to know if the author quoted above in speaking of "every mother everywhere" would include the illegitimate mother. We would not be warranted in inferring his intention to be such, since he always refers to motherhood as buttressed by a responsible and supporting fatherhood. Nevertheless we are constrained to move the question because of the protest now being raised in the name of the new ethics against the drawing of any distinction between legitimate and illegitimate motherhood. This protest is logical, for if erotic love may be indulged outside of marriage no stigma must be attached to its inevitable fruits. In this new morality the light as in Correggio's Holy Night will, Ellen Key tells us, radiate from the child. But sweet and engaging though this light be, it cannot be sufficient to dispell the darkness of antecedent sin. Our sympathy shall go out indeed to the helpless child, as our pity shall not fail the mother, particularly if, as the saying goes, she has been more sinned against than sinning. Yet evil she has done and that of a social kind. For despite the halo of romance thrown around it and the warmth of sentimentalism with which it is made to glow, the new sexual morality spells inevitably a lasting detriment to the due nurture of offspring. This, too, not because of a public opinion and attitude purely artificial and accidental in character, but because of violence done to nature's organ for the proper conservation of the race—monogamic marriage.

From what has been said it is not to be concluded that all individualism is dysgenic. But the individualism compatible with social weal has naught in it subversive of monogamy. If it seeks exemption from the solicitude described by the Apostle as the lot of the married, it is not to gain a larger opportunity

for indulgence but an ampler liberty for devotion. The dedication to things of the mind or spirit in which this individualism would assert itself is conditioned upon a life of celibacy. For it must be allowed that such dedication is hampered and checked by the cares and responsibilities of married life. Love can make these burdens seem easy; it cannot, however, make them less engrossing. While, therefore, the sensualist or slug-gard may see in such binding duties a compelling motive for celibacy, it can well be that freedom from their assumption can be desired for reasons altogether worthy.

Here now it is not our purpose to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of the pre-eminence of the virginal over the marital state. Rather would we indicate the eugenic value of the institution for which Mr. Galton, even more than Dean Inge, has words of condemnation.<sup>19</sup> For the high moral character of the Catholic religious Mr. Galton has unmistakable regard. Indeed, it is because of their individual nobility that he finds ground for his indictment against celibacy as an institution, since it is owing to this latter that these gentle nature have no continuance.

But the eugenist need not be told that there is a heritage other than an organic one—a heritage no less real than that transmitted through the germ-plasm.

Now everyone not widely prejudiced will acknowledge the debt the world is under to the mediæval celibates for the treasures of literature, which otherwise would have been irretrievably lost. Everyone should know, too, that only in peaceful and ordered seclusion from the stress and battlings whence emerged modern Europe could there be found the conditions for the sustained application necessary for this literary fruitage. But

" "Whenever a man or woman was possessed of a gentle nature that fitted him or her to deeds of charity, to meditation, to literature or to art, the social condition of the time was such that they had no refuge elsewhere than in the bosom of the Church. But the Church chose to preach and exact celibacy and the consequence was that these gentle natures had no continuance and this by a policy so singularly unwise and suicidal, that I am hardly able to speak of it without impatience. The Church brutalized the breed of our forefathers." Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius*, Mac-Millan, 1892. These words, Dr. Saleeby declares, should be printed in letters of gold. C. W. Saleeby, *Parenthood and Race Culture*, p. 132.



more valuable than mental or artistic accomplishment was the example of moral excellence left by the monks and nuns of whom Mr. Galton speaks. They were examples of self-conquest. Their continency gave the lie to the contention that the demands of the sexual appetite are so imperious that they must be satisfied. An illustration of this sovereignty of the spirit was needed not alone for those who were to make religious profession, but for society at large. It was fraught, as it ever will continue to be, with richest beneficence for the marital state. For if marriage is to be pure and its bed undefiled, there must be brought to it a clean mind and a chaste body. If it is not to be simply the means of gratifying erotic love, its bond enduring only as long as this kind of love shall last, it must know a life of continual restraint. It is required first of all for this that the self-mastery called for be regarded as within the due compass of human achievement. In the just appreciation of celibacy this thought finds its most effective inculcation.

But it is not in its eugenic value that celibacy finds its ultimate warrant. To say so is to fall into the basic error of the eugenists of constituting as an end what of its nature is but a means. The individual is for society in the sense that in society he is to gain the perfection and complement of his nature and faculties. But this perfection is not finally for society; it is that the component members may reach the destiny ordained by a Personal Creator. It is just here that there rests the ultimate title to all human rights. As this destiny, moreover, is an individual one, every rational being with reference to it is autocentric. In his advance to the goal he may not be stopped in any way or by any agency; yet between the rights of the individual and those of society there can be no real conflict. For in tending to his end the former must promote the aim and purpose of the latter, which finds its good in just the measure in which it conduces members to this very end. There is, therefore, a genuine individualism, one thoroughly compatible with the exigencies of society. Of such individualism is ecclesiastical celibacy.

JOHN WEBSTER MELODY.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**Bergson, an Exposition and Criticism,** by Thomas J. Gerrard.  
St. Louis, Herder. Pp. xii + 208. Price 90 cents.

The attempt to give a popular criticism of Professor Bergson's philosophy is justified by the fact that this philosophy is no longer restricted to philosophical literature, but has found its way in a more or less diluted form into ordinary magazines and even newspapers. As a method of criticism metaphors may prove useful in skilful hands, but Bergson is a master in this art, and some of those which we find in the book under review seem weak in comparison. At times also the argument ignores the real point at issue. For instance, no philosopher, Bergsonian or anti-Bergsonian, will be convinced by the following dilemma which is hardly more than a quibble: "Either the flux is or it is not. If it is not it has no reality. But it has reality. Therefore it is." It is what? A changing or a stable reality? This is the question. The reader would also like to know which editions or translations are quoted. Thus neither in the English translation nor in the French edition at my disposal have I been able to find the passages of *Creative Evolution* on the pages referred to by the author. The task of explaining and criticising Professor Bergson for the average reader is a difficult one, in which complete success is not to be expected. Such as it is, this book—a reprint of articles published in the *Catholic World*—will be serviceable as a guide for those who desire both an acquaintance with Bergson's philosophy and an indication of some lines along which a criticism of it may proceed.

C. A. DUBRAY, S. M.

---

**Francisco Palou's *Life and Apostolic Labors of the Venerable Father Junípero Serra, founder of the Franciscan Missions of California.*** English translation by G. Scott Williams. Introduction and Notes by George Wharton James. Pasadena, California, George Wharton James. 1913. Pp. 338.

The first historical work on Upper California, printed in Mexico

during 1787, was for a long time locked up from all Americans except the few who were able to read the Spanish. Even to them the volume was not easily accessible. In offering to the public an English version of this valuable book, Mr. James has therefore performed a service at once noteworthy and patriotic.

The importance of Father Palou's book, dealing as it does with the beginnings of California, is very great. Its worth is enhanced by the fact that it includes a great number of documents, and by the circumstance that its author, though he does not once allude to his own exploits, was a part of the grand achievements of Father Junípero Serra. Around the life of this venerable priest the author has woven the story of the founding of the California missions.

At the outset the author warns his reader not to expect any unusual graces of style, as he would be certain to find in the pages of Bossuet. Father Palou is a plain, blunt man, who loved his friends. Whatever may be said of his literary art his narrative is always interesting and clear. From the birth of Father Serra, November 24, 1713, in the island of Mallorca, the book relates the incidents of his rather feeble boyhood and youth, especially those influences which contributed to make him scholarly and pious. Though he had been christened Miguel Joseph, because of his great veneration for the holy companion of Saint Francis when, in 1731, he made his profession he took the name Junípero. Soon the delicate youth was growing not only in spiritual but in bodily strength. This improvement in health he ascribed to his having made his vows. His career as an instructor extended and confirmed his scholarship. Indeed, if he had not devoted himself to the conversion and the civilizing of savages, it is certain that he would have acquired renown as an orator.

He left his native land to work in the American wilderness. In 1750, after his arrival in Mexico, he renewed his novitiate in the College of San Fernando. During the same year he had his first experience as a missionary in the Sierra Gorda among the Pame Indians. The work among the members of this tribe was highly successful. The natives were instructed not only in the elements of Christian Doctrine but in the art of agriculture. At this time they had every species of cattle; also fruits, cereals, and vegetables. In a little while they were assigned separate holdings of land and given the seeds and the cattle necessary for

their cultivation. The example of the pious Father Junípero influenced the other missions to adopt his rational system. When his heart was gladdened by the abundant fruits of his zeal, he was chosen for work among the warlike Apaches. This he was destined not to undertake.

On June 25, 1767, the Society of Jesus was suppressed in New Spain. Sixteen of its members had labored in Lower California. The missions attended by them were recommended to the College of San Fernando, which has been mentioned above. By its Superior, Father Junípero was named as one of the friars for the California missions. With his companions he embarked in March, 1768. In a fortnight all were safe at Loreto. It was then concluded to found missions at San Diego, Monterey, and one under the name of San Buenaventura.

In the succeeding pages the reader will learn of spiritual heroes, and of the gigantic work undertaken and promoted by the Spanish monarchy. He will be told of the transportation of large quantities of seeds and great herds of cattle to regions more distant from Mexico than Moscow is from Madrid. He will see a strange cavalcade, fearless explorers, armored soldiers, picturesque friars, uncouth Indians, disembarking promptly and soon after winding its way through a changing landscape. This was not the sterile land of Lower California or the waterless waste of Arizona, both of which the Spaniards knew.

In this favored region there were soon founded five missions. Scarcely a detail of their establishment is omitted by the chronicler. We know how many axemen felled and fashioned the timber for each mission-house, how many pagans first approached the strangers, and the number converted before the death of the pious founder. The dusky lambs looked harmless to their new pastors, who had yet to learn that the superstitions of the Indian often drove him to madness. It was some baseless fear of their new friends that led a thousand frenzied red men to attack and destroy the San Diego mission. The survivors were at first appalled, but the murder of a missionary was no novelty to the followers of Saint Francis. Centuries before they had cheerfully encountered perils from Palestine to Peking. Now they merely rebuilt the ruined station and established new ones, among them Santa Clara and San Francisco.

The zealous Father Junípero was equally tranquil before the ben

ded bow of an Indian and the raised dagger of an English fanatic. In a word, he knew no fear. To his perfect faith, his humility, and his hunger for souls are to be ascribed the miracles wrought in Upper California. This entertaining book will make the reader acquainted with the Venerable Father Junípero Serra as he never knew him by panegyric. In it he will behold a worthy disciple of Saint Francis. A map of both Californias, reproduced from the original work, and annotated by Mr. James, indicates the location of the Franciscan missions and the geography of the entire coastal region.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

---

**Searching the Scriptures**, by Rev. T. P. F. Gallagher. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1912. 12mo, 431 pp. \$1.75 net.

The book is divided into two parts, corresponding to the twofold task to which the author has applied himself, namely to ascertain what are the prophetic passages in the Old Testament that clearly point to the future Messiah, and to show that these prophecies find their fulfillment in our Lord Jesus Christ. In his treatment of the prophecies, he keeps well within the bounds of strict conservative orthodoxy. The rationalistic critics, who try to find a natural explanation for every event in sacred history, are unsparingly taken to task at every turn. While the author may not always convince, there is no mistaking his zeal in the defense of traditional views of Scripture. Sometimes it is to be feared his acquaintance with the critics is not as accurate as might be, as when, for example, he says on page vii that, "Strauss indeed denied the historic existence of Jesus." For some reason the book has not been provided with a table of contents.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**La révélation primitive et les données actuelles de la science**, d'après l'ouvrage allemand du R. P. G. Schmidt. A. Lemonnyer, O. P. 12mo, 335 pp. Paris, J. Gabalda, 1914.

One has to read the preface to discover that this work is simply a translation, embellished with a few extra footnotes, of a German

treatise of Father Schmidt. Even then no information is vouchsafed regarding the original, which is a contribution to the German apologetic work in three volumes entitled, *Religion, Christentum und Kirche*, the joint product of several scholars, edited by Professors Esser and Mausbach. Father Schmidt's contribution is found in the first volume under the title, *Die Uroffenbarung als Anfang der Offenbarung Gottes*. The author, William Schmidt, whose name is incorrectly given as G. Schmidt on the title page of the above-mentioned French translation, is a member of the missionary Society of the Divine Word, and enjoys an international reputation as editor of the learned publication, *Anthropos*, and as the author of several books and articles dealing with anthropology and the history of primitive religions.

In the treatise under review, the author has in mind to set forth on the basis of acquired results of modern science the historic likelihood and reality of the story of primitive revelation as told in the opening chapters of Genesis. From a study of the inspired record, he comes to the conclusion that while God revealed Himself to our first parents as their supernatural end, the contents of that revelation were so simple and limited as easily to be grasped by normal, though untrained human minds. They were little more than the fundamental truths that God exists, that He is the maker of all things, the guardian of the moral law, the requiter of good and evil, that man owes Him strict obedience, that husband and wife are equal and should live in loving, inseparable companionship. Now, he finds, the earliest representatives of mankind known to science were capable of receiving such a revelation as this, and the similarity of their religious and moral life with that portrayed in Genesis in respect to first man tells strongly in favor of the reality of primitive revelation.

Who are these earliest types of men known to science? They are first of all those whose scanty remains have been revealed by prehistoric archaeology. These prehistoric men, he observes, have left evidence that they buried their dead with care, looking to a life beyond the grave, and hence having a religion. If their tools were largely of roughly hewn stone, they show the use of intelligence, and that too of a high order. They were fit subjects for such a revelation as is recorded in the beginning of Genesis. A few anthropologists struck by the brutal character of some of the human jaw-bones dating from prehistoric times have concluded

that primitive man did not possess the power of articulate speech. This is a mistake, for so great an authority as Klaatsch calls attention to the fact that many Australians today have the same form of jaw and palate.

But it is in the field of ethnology that the author finds the strongest argument for the reality of primitive revelation. He accepts the principle championed by so many anthropologists that the nearest approaches to primitive man and to primitive life are to be found in certain savage tribes whose culture rests on a low plane by reason of retarded development. He finds the best representatives of early man in the so-called pigmy tribes—the negrillos of Central Africa, the Negritos of the Phillipines, the dark dwarfed natives of Malacca, the Andaman Islands, and of Southeast Australia. According to Kollmann and other anthropologists, all races of man are descendants of primitive pigmy forms, which in turn arose by a process of development from anthropoid apes. The theory of evolution thus lends weight to the view that the existing pigmy races are the nearest representatives known of primitive man. In view of this, it is not surprising that Father Schmidt should betray a certain amount of sympathy for the evolution theory, though he does this in language carefully guarded. He recognizes, to be sure, that it is still an unproved theory, but he is impressed with the fact that it is held in favor by the great majority of biological experts, Catholics included. While he finds that Genesis itself may be interpreted in favor of a divinely ordained evolution of man's body as well as in favor of its direct formation from the slime of the earth, he is forced to recognize a serious obstacle in the decision of the Biblical Commission declaring the historical reality of the formation of the first woman from the first man.

On the supposition that the pigmy tribes are the best known representatives of primitive man, Father Schmidt proceeds to show that, all things considered, their religious and moral life is not very far removed from that portrayed in Genesis of our first parents. Nature-worship, ghost-worship, and magic are but slightly developed among them. A supreme being, whom they feebly worship, is the object of their reverence. He is known by such names as Heaven, Thunderer, Lord, Father, and is generally conceived with anthropomorphic traits, as dwelling in heaven. He is not represented by any artificial forms. He is legislator and guar-

dian of the moral law, rewarding the good and punishing the wicked. The moral standard is much higher than what is found elsewhere among savage peoples. Monogamy is almost universal. Conjugal fidelity is strongly insisted on. There is no slavery, no infanticide, no killing of the aged. The children are taught to be truthful, honest, kind, respectful to the aged and those in distress. If religion in so high a form can exist on an enduring basis among these benighted savages, by what right shall we deny a similar, tho purer, religion to Adam? Is not the religious and moral life of these savages best explained as a preservation, with retarded development, of primitive conditions?

Father Schmidt finds features of their religious, moral and economic life that go to bear out the truth of the picture given in Genesis. In the first place, among all the pigmies, except the Samangs of Malacca, there is a first-fruit-offering to the supreme being as lord and proprietor of all things. This form of sacrifice, he thinks, carries us back to the Garden of Eden, where the command of God not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was tantamount to a first-fruit-sacrifice, for the prohibition was probably intended to be but temporary, to be rewarded after due time with the enjoyment of this forbidden fruit as well as that of the tree of life, which was to give immortality. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel were first-fruit-offerings.

In the second place, the general custom of monogamy among the pigmies, with the exclusion of the matriarchal system, is evidence that the monogamy depicted in Genesis is the truly primitive form.

Thirdly, the picture which Genesis gives of Adam and Eve subsisting on the fruits which nature in her bounty presented is quite in accordance with primitive conditions as found among the pigmies. They live by hunting, fishing, and picking such edible fruits and plants as grow without cultivation. Again, Father Schmidt observes, in primitive conditions, it is the man who looks after the procuring of animal foods, while the woman is busied with the gathering of fruits and useful plants. He thinks it significant that in the Genesis story it is Adam who gave the names to the animals, and holds it not unlikely that Eve had the naming of the plants. At any rate it was she who plucked the forbidden fruit and gave it to her husband.

Such is the gist of the work which Father Schmidt has pro-



duced, with an arrangement of material which does not bespeak the highest sense of logical order. It is not advisable here to dwell on another chapter of the work in which he calls to task the leading skeptical critics of Genesis and tries on the basis of Hilprecht's Nippur discoveries to prove the greater antiquity of the Genesis story of Paradise and the Flood in comparison with the Babylonian versions. He has brought together in this work useful material for showing the likelihood of primitive revelation, but it can hardly be said that his attempted proof of the reality of the Genesis story of primitive revelation on the basis of modern science amounts to a strict demonstration.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Commentaire français littéral de la Somme Théologique de Saint Thomas d'Aquin.** O. P. Pègues. T. VIII, Les Vertus et Les Vices (Toulouse, 1913, Edouard Privat, 14 Rue des Arts.)

The eighth volume of Father Pègues excellent translation and commentary deals with the subjects treated in Q. Q. 55-89 of St. Thomas' *Prima-Secundae* (for other volumes see *Catholic University Bulletin*, April, 1913). Those who are familiar with the order of the *Summa* know that these Questions are a continuation of the treatise on Habits (*Habitus*). Habits in general were explained in the preceding tracts (q. q. 49-55): it is now time to consider good Habits, i. e., the *Virtues* (q. q. 55-70) and evil Habits, i. e., the *Vices* and the *Sins* which they cause (q. q. 70-89). To the treatise on Virtues is annexed the study of the Gifts, Beatitudes and Fruits of the Holy Ghost. Since St. Thomas has been styled "the most saintly of learned men," one naturally expects to find a combination of learning and holiness manifested in his writings on these subjects so intimately related to the salvation of souls. The student of these treatises will not be disappointed. Here he will find in abundance, briefly and accurately exposed, salutary doctrine on the virtues which men should practice and the sins which they should avoid. In this part of the *Summa* he treats of them in a general way only: a more complete and detailed exposition is reserved for the *Secunda-Secundae*. He treats of the virtues and sins both as a philosopher and as a

theologian. In his *Ethics* Aristotle explained natural virtues in a manner that was most creditable to a pagan. Using and perfecting his principles St. Thomas explains the intellectual, moral and theological virtues so luminously and so accurately that even one who is not a deep student can see that grace does not destroy but perfects nature. He was a wonderful psychologist as well as a saintly believer in Christian truth, and we know that he practiced what he taught. This gives added weight to his conclusions on subjects of vital importance to all who wish to know what men should do and what they should avoid. His treatise on original sin has long been recognized as a model of penetration combined with accuracy and sobriety of judgment. The articles in which the Angelic Doctor explains the Gifts, Beatitudes and Fruits of the Holy Ghost (q. q. 68, 69, 70) deserve special attention. They are the foundation of all solid books of instruction on those subjects written since the time of St. Thomas. Many points of his teaching were emphasized by Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical on the Holy Spirit (*Divinum Illud*, May 4, 1897), and that these truths are of great importance in our times will be evident to those who read that remarkable document concerning "the indwelling and miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, and the extent and efficiency of His action, both in the whole body of the Church and in the individual souls of its members, through the glorious abundance of his divine graces."

In his commentary Father Pègues prudently refrains from a discussion of the many doubts and controversies which have busied theologians treating of the virtues and sins. He seeks to let St. Thomas speak for himself, giving just enough of commentary to enable his readers to ascertain the true mind of the Angelic Doctor, and this is always more satisfactory than anything that can be found in the works of other authors. There may be room for a difference of opinions among sincere believers, yet always will there be genuine respect for the opinions of one who never lightly gave expression to any opinion.

Father Pègues must be an indefatigable worker. He gives to the public every year at least one volume of his lucid commentary, notwithstanding the many duties connected with his position as Professor of Theology in the international house of studies in Rome, where he expounds the second part of the *Summa* of St. Thomas.

D. J. KENNEDY, O. P.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### Historical Sketch of the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.

The *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* or Collection of Oriental Christian Writers is the general title of a series of publications issued by the Gabalda firm of Paris under the auspices of THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA and THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN. This collection, when completed, will number about eight hundred volumes and include practically all the known Christian works now extant in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic and Armenian. It will add many interesting documents to Oriental literature and throw considerable light on the history of the Eastern Church from the beginnings of Christianity to the end of the Middle Ages. We have thought that a short sketch of the origin and scope of this important collection would be acceptable not only to the readers of *The Bulletin* but also to all those who are interested in the work of The Catholic University of America.

Like many other great enterprises the *Corpus Scriptorum* developed from humble and modest beginnings. About twelve years ago the Abbé Jouin, rector of the Church of St. Augustine in Paris, a poet of considerable reputation, wished to make use of a hymn contained in the works of St. Ephrem, one of the most celebrated Fathers of the Syrian Church. As this document was still unedited, he asked the Rev. Dr. Chabot, a distinguished Orientalist, to interpret it for him. So struck was the learned Abbé with the beauty and depth of thought which the translation revealed to him that he said to his friend: "Semitic scholars spend much time on Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions and records, which are of immediate interest only for profane history, when they could devote it much more profitably to the writings of the Eastern Fathers which contain so much valuable information concerning the doctrines and institutions of the early Church. The Abbé Migne gave us the Greek and Latin Patrologies which render immense service to students of Church History and Dogmatic Theology; why do you not follow his example, edit an Ori-

ental Patrology, and, by means of a good Latin translation, place within the reach of those who are not familiar with Semitic languages the incomparable Christian literature that lies hidden away and forgotten in the great libraries of Europe and America? Surely no document, that can shed any light on the development of Christianity, should be a matter of indifference to the world." Dr. Chabot remarked that a task of such magnitude and difficulty would necessarily involve a vast expenditure of labor and money, that enthusiasm and good will were not sufficient, that he who would build a monument should first of all compute the cost. The good Abbé, undismayed by these objections, urged his friend to begin the work and assured him that he and others were ready to help in a financial way until the publication could be made self-supporting.

Encouraged by the kind words of Abbé Jouin and the advice of the Marquis Melchior de Vogüé, one of the foremost archaeologists of modern times, Dr. Chabot decided to organize his Oriental Patrology. He was especially fitted for such a work. After graduating as Doctor of Theology from the University of Louvain in 1892, he devoted himself to Syriac literature and Semitic epigraphy. His writings, up to the present, constitute a small library in themselves. Among them we may mention: *The Life of Isaac of Niniveh*, a doctorate dissertation, *The Chronicle of Denys of Tell-Mare*, *The Commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Gospel of St. John*, *The History of the patriarch Iaballaha III*, *The Synodicon Orientale* or Collection of the Canons of the Nestorian Church, and especially his edition of the *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian*, a work of the utmost importance for the history of the Arabs at the time of the Crusades. Besides these publications he has contributed many important articles to scientific periodicals and he is actually preparing a volume for the Corpus of Semitic Inscriptions. In recognition of his achievements in the field of Christian literature the French Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres bestowed upon him in 1910 its highest award, the Jean Reynaud prize, of the value of ten thousand francs.

Thus, Dr. Chabot was well qualified by training and experience to organize the Collection of Oriental Christian Writers. In January 1903 he sent a circular to many prominent Orientalists outlining his plans and soliciting their co-operation. Though he

held out no immediate prospect of pecuniary remuneration, it must be said to the honor and disinterestedness of science that a large number of scholars volunteered their services and promised to contribute one or more volumes to the Collection. Among those who first responded to his appeal four deserve a special notice here, for they became with him the directors of the Corpus and for the last ten years have given liberally of their time and means to further its success: Dr. Hyvernât of The Catholic University of America, Ignazio Guidi of the Sapienza University in Rome, Baron Carra de Vaux of the Institut of Paris, and Father Cheikhô, S. J. of the University of Beirut in Syria. Dr. Hyvernât took charge of the Coptic section of the Corpus. No man was better fitted for the task. After receiving the degree of Doctor of Theology from the Pontifical University at Rome he turned his attention to Oriental studies and made a specialty of Coptic language and literature. He was professor of Assyriology and Egyptology in the Schools of St. Apollinare from 1885 to 1887 and Interpreter for Syriac, Coptic and Arabic, at the Propaganda until 1888. During the year 1888-1889 he was sent by the French government on a scientific mission to Armenia and the East. In this journey he was accompanied by his friend Mgr. Muller-Simonis of Strasbourg, and the two travelers related their experiences and discoveries in their book entitled *Du Caucase au Golfe Persique*, Paris, 1889. During his sojourn in the Eternal City, Dr. Hyvernât published *The Acts of the Martyrs of Egypt* and *An Album of Coptic Palaeography* in which he gives photographic specimens from the most important Coptic mss. in the different libraries of Europe. This Album is considered as one of the foundation-stones of Coptic Palaeography. In 1889 Dr. Hyvernât was called by Bishop Keane to THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA to organize the department of Egyptian and Semitic languages and literatures. In the midst of his professorial duties he has found time to publish two very important works: *A Short Introduction to the Hebrew Massora* and *A Study on the Coptic Versions of the Church of Egypt*. Under his constant care and supervision the Oriental department of THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA has reached a high degree of efficiency and the students have at their disposal his magnificent private library which contains about 12,000 volumes and pamphlets on Oriental literatures and cognate subjects besides a good number of mss. Syriac, Persian,

Arabic, Turkish and Armenian. Most of these are still unpublished and offer splendid opportunities for personal research.

Ignazio Guidi, who was entrusted with the Ethiopic section of the Corpus, needs no introduction to the scientific world. He is universally considered as one of the best all around Orientalists of the present generation, and in the last thirty years no one has done more for the advancement of Oriental Christian literature. Gifted with an extraordinary ability for Semitic and modern languages he has contributed articles in Italian, French and German, to the best periodicals of Europe. He has made a special study of Arabic and Ethiopic and he is today the foremost authority on Amharic, the modern representative of the Old Ethiopic. Dr. Guidi has published many of the Syriac and Ethiopic volumes of the Corpus, besides an elementary Amharic Grammar and an Amharic-Italian Dictionary.

Baron Carra de Vaux, who first took charge of the Arabic section of the Corpus and Father Cheikho who succeeded him in the same capacity, have done excellent work in this department of Semitic studies. The former is well-known for several important contributions to Arabic philology and philosophy especially his *Avicenna* published in the series *Les Grands Philosophes*; the latter has written an elementary Arabic Grammar and has edited a splendid Arabic Chrestomathy entitled *Magani* or *Flowers from Arabic Literature*.

Such were the men first associated with Dr. Chabot in the management of the Collection of Oriental Christian Writers. In order to introduce method and system in the work they divided each Oriental literature into several groups or series and resolved to translate all the Oriental texts into Latin so as to make them accessible to students who are not acquainted with Semitic languages. The Syriac section was distributed into four groups: I. Apocryphal Books, Liturgy and Canon Law; II. Philosophy, Theology and Exegesis; III. History and Hagiography; IV. Documents of foreign origin especially translations from the Greek. Of this section, which will include about two hundred volumes, the following have appeared: *The Minor Chronicles*; *Documents related to the origins of the Monophysites*; *The Treatises of Philoxenus on the Trinity and the Incarnation*; *The Letters of the Patriarch Iesuyab III*; *The Commentaries of Denys bar Salibi on the Liturgy, on the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the*

*Apocalypse and the Catholic Epistles; The Opus Chronologicum of Elias of Nisibis; The Lives of the Most Illustrious Monophysites; The Syriac text of the Scholia of Theodore Bar Koni and of the Commentary of St. Cyril of Alexandria on the Gospel of St. John.*

The Arabic section is made up of three series: I. Apocryphal Literature, Liturgy and Canon Law; II. Exegesis, Philosophy and Theology; III. History and Hagiography—in all about seventy volumes. Of these have been edited: *The Oriental History of Peter ibn Rahib, The Universal History of Agapius of Mabbogh, The Annals of Eutychius, and The Synaxary of the Church of Alexandria.* The Ethiopic section is divided into two groups: I. Apocryphal Books, Canon Law, Liturgy, Philosophy and Theology; II. History and Hagiography. Sixteen volumes from this section have been published so far: *The Apocryphal Documents concerning the Blessed Virgin; The Abyssinian Philosophers; The History of King Sarsa Dengel, The Annals of Kings John I, Iyasu I and Bakaffa; The Annals of Kings Iyasu II and Iyo'as; Documents Relating to Abyssinian History and the following Acta Martyrum; SS. Yared and Pantalewon; SS. Michael and Anorewos; SS. Aaron and Philip; St. Eustathius; St. Mercurius; SS. Fere Michael and Zara Abrahm; SS. Abekerazum and Harawayat and St. Wallatta Petros.* Coptic literature forms three series: I. Apocryphal Books and Liturgy; II. Theology; II. History and Hagiography—in all about fifty volumes. The important collection of Coptic mss. acquired by the late J. Pierpont Morgan, which will be mentioned later in this notice, will be edited in the *Corpus* and will constitute a special series of about fifty volumes known as the *Series Morganiana*. Of the Coptic section four volumes have appeared: one of the *Acts of the Martyrs*, one of the *Life*, and two of the *Works of Shenouti* who, next to Pachomius, was the most famous leader of cenobitism and undoubtedly the most prolific and forceful writer of the Coptic Church.

Thus since the year 1903 the editors of the *Corpus* have published over forty numbers, each number constituting two volumes, one of text and one of Latin translation. It is worthy of note that the work done has elicited admiration and praise in all quarters; the volumes have been very favorably reviewed, and the constantly increasing number of subscriptions shows that this Collection is supplying a real need in the world of letters. Up to

the year 1912 the *Corpus Scriptorum* was merely a private enterprise under the control and management of Drs. Chabot, Hyvernat and Guidi. Thanks to their self-sacrifice and scientific prestige it now enjoys a world-wide reputation. However, the editors foresaw that, in spite of their zeal and enthusiasm, they would not be able, of themselves, to complete such a vast collection. They had given the example and shown the way; it was time for others to take up a part of the burden. They feared too, that, in the event of their demise, the publication might be discontinued. Hence in the beginning of the year 1912 they appealed to the authorities of The University of Louvain and The Catholic University of America and asked them to take charge of the *Corpus Scriptorum* so as to insure its continuance, its more rapid progress and ultimate completion. They pointed out that the Collection was almost self-supporting, that subscriptions were on the increase, and that the two universities not only would run no financial risk but would eventually derive much profit from the undertaking. They would enrich their libraries with photographs of Oriental manuscripts, they could exchange the volumes of the *Corpus* for other great publications which are very expensive when purchased outright, and would be in a position to do for the cause of Oriental literature what the Academies of Berlin and Vienna are doing by their editions of the Greek and Latin Fathers.

This project was formally presented to the authorities of the two universities and accepted by them with enthusiasm. Articles were drawn up by which the editors surrendered their rights and interests so that now the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* is the property of the two universities and is being published under their joint responsibility. There is no doubt that these two great centers of learning have both the means and ability to carry on this important work with success. The University of Louvain enjoys the prestige which attaches to an excellent institution of long standing and counts among its professors and graduates a large number of distinguished Orientalists. The Catholic University of America, though only in the twenty-fifth year of its existence, has won the admiration, respect and confidence of men of all classes and creeds; it has a well-equipped department of Semitic languages and literatures and numbers four Orientalists among its professors and eight among its graduates. Furthermore the *Corpus Scriptorum* will remain under the editorial charge of



its former owners, Drs. Chabot, Guidi and Hyvernat. With them is now associated Dr. Forget of Louvain, well-known for many excellent contributions to Arabic literature and for his edition of the Synaxary of the Alexandrian Church, who has assumed the direction of the Arabic section of the *Corpus*. The rectors of the two Universities and the present editors are assisted by two committees, one in Louvain and one in Washington, the former consisting of Drs. Van Hoonacker, Coppieters, Lefort and Lebon, and the latter of Drs. Cöln, Butin and Vaschalde. Circulars have been sent to all institutions of learning formally announcing the transfer of the *Corpus Scriptorum* and asking the coöperation and support of all those who are interested in the diffusion of Christian literature.

The preceding historical sketch is sufficient to show that the *Corpus Scriptorum* is a colossal undertaking the importance of which cannot be overestimated. It will prove a veritable mine of information for the different departments of Oriental literature and ecclesiastical science especially for Philology, Biblical studies, Philosophy, Dogmatic Theology, Church History, Liturgy and Canon Law, as was pointed out in the *Catholic University Bulletin* (Dec. 1911). However, the *Corpus Scriptorum* has recently assumed additional importance from the fact that the rich collection of fifty Coptic manuscripts found in the ruins of the Monastery of St. Michael in the Fayyum and acquired by the late J. Pierpont Morgan, will be published as a special series of its Coptic section under the supervision of Dr. Hyvernat of The Catholic University. Although much has been written in newspapers and reviews concerning this wonderful collection, it will be well to point out its significance in the field of Coptic studies.

The greater part of the Coptic literary remains, which we hitherto possessed, have come down to us in a most wretched condition. The ancient manuscripts, which escaped the pillage and destruction of the Egyptian monasteries in the Middle Ages, have partly perished owing to the indifference, carelessness, or ignorance of their possessors when Arabic supplanted Coptic as the vernacular and literary speech of the country. When, in the eighteenth century, European scholars and travelers began to search for those literary treasures, Coptic manuscripts acquired some commercial value in the eyes of their owners but their condition was not thereby improved. It became a custom with the Arabs,

who had Coptic manuscripts to sell, to divide them into several portions, to distribute the leaves among the different families of the tribe and dispose of them piecemeal in the hope of securing a higher price for them. Thus the Vatican Library, the British Museum of London and the National Library of Paris, have come into possession of fragments which originally belonged to the same manuscript. When it is question of biblical texts such scattered fragments may often be identified and grouped together, but in the case of historical or theological documents reconstruction is well-nigh impossible. It is very probable that the Fayyum Collection would have gone the way of all the others but for the energy of Dr. Chassinat, director of the French Institute of Archaeology at Cairo, who persuaded an antiquarian to buy all these manuscripts at any cost. Thus fifty of them found their way to Paris where they were purchased by the late J. Pierpont Morgan in December, 1911. Five of them still remain in the Egyptian Museum at Cairo.

The discovery of the Fayyum manuscripts and their purchase by one of America's most distinguished sons are two important events in the annals of Coptic studies. Scholars agree in saying that the Morgan Collection is the most complete collection of Coptic manuscripts ever brought together. Forty-seven of them are written in Sahidic or dialect of Upper Egypt, one in Bohairic or dialect of the Delta, and the other two in Fayyumic the dialect of the province in which the collection was found. They are remarkable first for their age and provenance. Twenty of them are dated: three from the beginning of the tenth century (903, 906, 914), four belong to the year 893 and thirteen range from 893 to 823. This latter date is the earliest yet found in any dated Coptic manuscript and is anterior by thirty-nine years to the date of the oldest dated Greek uncial manuscript (862). Hence from the standpoint of Coptic palaeography the collection is invaluable and will supplement the *Album of Coptic Palaeography* published by Hyvernât in 1888. The provenance of these manuscripts is of great historical interest. The fact that they were all written in the Fayyum, as appears from the colophons of the scribes, shows that the Sahidic dialect had become the literary speech of that province as early as the ninth or eighth century, and since all the colophons are in the Fayyumic dialect we may conclude that this dialect still obtained as a spoken language.

Another important feature of the Morgan manuscripts is that many of them have preserved their original bindings which are possibly the oldest and, at any rate, the best authenticated specimens of the art of book-binding among the Copts. These bindings consist of coarse boards about half an inch thick made of layers of papyrus sheets taken from older manuscripts. The covers are in brown leather stamped with geometrical designs and cut through so as to allow the insertion of gems and precious stones. In one case the decoration is obtained by means of narrow strips of red leather delicately stitched in the cover. It was the custom of the Egyptian scribes to paint the large letters, to adorn the titles of books and chapters with multicolored figures, and to fill up the margins with drawings of flowers, birds and quadrupeds. Most of the Morgan manuscripts abound in this style of illumination; but more interesting still is the fact that a dozen of them contain full page miniatures representing the Blessed Virgin with her divine Son, angels, martyrs, anchorites, and other saints. This is important for the history of the art of manuscript illuminating, for so far no miniatures had been found in Coptic manuscripts anterior to the eleventh century.

However, the priceless value of this collection lies in the nature of its documents. Like all monastic libraries of the early times it includes three chief kinds of works: biblical books, liturgical writings, and theological treatises. The Old Testament is represented by six complete books of which we had only fragments of uncertain age and provenance: Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, I and II Kings, and Isaias. Of the New Testament it contains Matthew, Mark, John, all complete; Luke with about eight chapters missing (iv. 33-ix. 30; ix. 12-xiii. 17); the fourteen epistles of St. Paul and seven Catholic Epistles (I and II Peter, I, II, III John, James, and Jude). Thus we have at last a few complete books of the Bible that present a definite Sahidic recension at a given time of Coptic history. The Bohairic New Testament is represented by a single manuscript of the four Gospels; unfortunately it has many lacunae, but nevertheless, it may have considerable critical value as it is one of the oldest, if not the oldest copy of the four Gospels in that dialect.

Liturgical literature is represented only by three documents but they are most precious and unique. They are: A complete *Lecti-  
onary* containing valuable information as to the sanctoral and the

general arrangement of ecclesiastical feasts throughout the year; a Breviary and an Antiphonary, two works of which we had only a few fragments that challenged all attempts at reconstruction. The Collection is rich in theological and hagiographical material. Of the writings of the native theologians it contains a volume of Shenouti and different treatises by John of Ashmounein, Basil of Pemge, Constantine of Siout, Stephen of Henes, Macarius of Tkoou, and translations of some writings of the patriarchs of Alexandria: Peter, Theophilus, Cyril, Theodore, Isaac and especially Athanasius. There are also translations of some of the works of the Greek Fathers: Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Severus of Antioch and others. All these works were evidently the best known to the Egyptian monks and must have been copied very frequently; thanks to the complete copies of the collection critics will be able to identify a great number of theological fragments scattered through the different European collections.

It was the wish of the late J. Pierpont Morgan that his collection of Coptic manuscripts should, as soon as possible, be made available to scholars and students. We are glad to inform our readers that work on this collection has been progressing steadily ever since The Catholic University of America was entrusted with its publication. Dr. Hyvernât is writing a descriptive catalogue of the collection which will be of great importance for Coptic palaeography. Four volumes of the collection are now in preparation and will be published after the appearance of the catalogue: *The Gospels* by Sir Ernest Thompson, *Isaias* by Mgr. Hebbelynck, *I and II Kings* by Dieu, *The Works of Samuel of Kalamon*, by Van Cawenberg, and *The Book of Hermenias or Antiphonary* by Drs. Hyvernât and Vaschalde. The remaining volumes will be edited as rapidly as is consistent with sound scholarship.

A. VASCHALDE.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

Dr. Hyvernats has returned to the University from a six or seven months stay in Europe. A considerable portion of that time was spent by him in research in the various libraries of Europe in connection with his work on the Morgan collection of Coptic mss. The principal Coptic collections visited by him were those of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; British Museum, London; John Rylands Library, Manchester; University Library, Strassburg; University Library, Freiburg i. B.; University Library, Heidelberg; the Royal Library of Venice; the Ambrosian Library of Milan and the Vatican Library in Rome. Dr. Hyvernats was received everywhere with the greatest courtesy: everybody seemed anxious to help him bring out as soon, and in as perfect a manner, as possible, the catalogue of what is justly considered the most complete collection of Coptic mss. ever discovered. As already noted in the *Bulletin* this collection consists of fifty complete or almost complete mss. and various fragments. Thirty of these mss. have their original bindings, more or less completely preserved. Not any two of these exhibit the same patterns. It is hardly necessary to add that such a collection of bindings is entirely unique. It is a most complete illustration of the technique of book-binding from the fifth to the tenth century of our era. Yet this is but one aspect of this wonderful collection, which is no less remarkable for its primitive style of miniatures and vastly more so for its paleographical and literary value. Most of the documents it contains are entirely new and with few exceptions, the others were known from fragments only. Dr. Hyvernats is now engaged in classifying and studying, with the assistance of his library the immense material he has accumulated during this last and his preceding trips abroad. The entire collection, as our readers know, will be published in the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*. Several volumes are already in preparation, and will be published as soon as the catalogue is

out. Dr. Hyvernats has secured as contributors to this huge undertaking the best Coptic scholars both in Europe and in America.

Dr. Hyvernats has resumed the direction of his Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures, which has become the American home of the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*.

---

**Spiritual Retreat.** The annual spiritual retreat for the ecclesiastical students of the University began at 8 p. m., on Wednesday, February 25th, and closed on Monday morning, March first. It was conducted by Most Reverend James J. Keane, D. D., Archbishop of Dubuque. The spiritual retreat for lay students, conducted by Rev. Godfrey Hunt, O. F. M., began on Friday, February 27th, and ended on Sunday, March first.

---

**Feast of St. Thomas.** The Patronal Feast of the Faculty of Philosophy was celebrated by a High Mass in the chapel of Gibbons Hall on Saturday, March 7th, at 10.30 a. m. The celebrant was the Very Reverend John Spensley, D. D., President of Gibbons Hall. At 4.30 p. m. a lecture was given on "St. Thomas and Social Justice" by Rev. James J. Fox, D. D.

---

**Knights of Columbus Scholarships.** Forms of application for these Scholarships have been sent out to the different colleges. The details, such as time, place, etc., of the examinations will be made known not later than April 15. Meantime, the following regulations governing the granting of the Scholarships have been promulgated by the University.

The Fifty Graduate Scholarships founded in the Catholic University of America by the Knights of Columbus are now open, where practical, to competitive examination.

I. Only young laymen who have obtained the degree Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or a corresponding degree, are eligible to these scholarships. Bachelors of Law must have previously obtained the A. B. degree.

II. Applicants must be, by preference, Knights of Columbus, or sons of members of the Order, and must contemplate going on for the Master's or Doctor's degree in the Schools of Philosophy, Sciences, Letters, or Law.

III. These scholarships furnish board, lodging, and tuition, during the time prescribed for the aforesaid degrees. All other expenses, laboratory fees, etc., are at the charge of the student.

IV. Forms of application may be obtained from Rt. Rev Thomas J. Shahan, D.D., Rector of the Catholic University. These forms call for the full name of the applicant and correct address; place and date of birth; accurate record of primary school, high school, and collegiate education. The candidate should also state the principal study which he desires to take up.

V. The candidate must present three certificates: (a) From the Grand Knight of his Council attesting his right to compete; (b) from his parish priest attesting good moral conduct; (c) from the President or Secretary of his college attesting the graduate degree received.

VI. Applications will be received by the Rector of the University until April 1, after which date the exact time, place, and conditions of the examination will be communicated to all eligible applicants..

VII. Graduate students of the current year may take the examination, but must have obtained the requisite degree before entering the University.

VIII. The successful candidates must present themselves at the University on the opening day of the scholastic year, September 29, 1914.

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*April, 1914.*

*No. 4.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.



**J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XX.*

*April, 1914.*

---

*No. 4.*

## THE MORALITY OF INTEREST ON CAPITAL.

---

In his address as President of the American Sociological Society at the annual meeting, December 27, 1913, Professor Albion W. Small denounced "the fallacy of treating capital as though it were an active agent in human processes, and crediting income to the personal representatives of capital irrespective of their actual share in human service." His criticism of the modern interest-system was, as he expressly declared, based primarily upon grounds of social utility rather than upon formally ethical considerations.

The Rev. William Hohoff has attacked interest from the strictly moral viewpoint. In a work entitled "Die Bedeutung der Marxschen Kapitalkritik" (Paderborn, 1908) he contended that whenever the owner of any sort of capital exacts the return of anything beyond the principal, there is committed a violation of strict, or commutative, justice (pp. 64-67, 88, 89, 96). According to his view, the Church has never formally authorized or permitted interest, even on invested capital (as distinguished from loans). She has merely tolerated it as an irremovable evil.

Is there any satisfactory justification of interest? If so, does it rest on individual or on social grounds? That is to say, is interest justified immediately and intrinsically by the mere relations that are entered into by the owner and the user or

beneficiary of capital? Or, is it rendered morally lawful only because of its effects upon society? What light, if any, is thrown upon these questions by the anti-usury legislation of the Catholic Church?

Taking up the last question first, we recall that during the Middle Ages all interest on *loans* was forbidden under severe penalties by repeated ordinances of Popes and Councils (Cf. Van Roey, "De Justo Auctario ex Contractu Crediti"; and Ryan, "The Church and Interest Taking"). Since the end of the seventeenth century the Church has quite generally permitted interest on one or more extrinsic grounds, or "titles." The first of these titles was that known as "*lucrum cessans*," or relinquished gain. It came into existence whenever a person who might have invested his money in a productive object, for example, a house, a farm, or a mercantile enterprise, decided instead to lend the money to some borrower. In such cases the interest on the loan was regarded as proper compensation for the gain which the owner might have obtained from an investment on his own account. The title created by this situation was called "*extrinsic*" because it arose out of circumstances extrinsic to the essential relations of borrower and lender. Not because of the loan itself, but because the loan prevented the lender from investing his money in a productive enterprise, was interest on the former held to be justified. In other words, interest on the loan was looked upon as merely the fair equivalent of the interest that might have been obtained on the investment.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, another title or justification of loan-interest found some favor among Catholic moralists. This was the "*praemium legale*," or legal rate of interest allowed by civil governments. Whenever the State authorized a definite rate of interest, the lender might, according to these writers, take advantage of it with a clear conscience.

Today the majority of Catholic authorities on the subject prefer the title of virtual productivity as a justification. Money, they contend, has become virtually productive. It can readily be exchanged for income-bearing or productive

property, such as, land, houses, railroads, machinery, and distributive establishments. Hence it has become the economic equivalent of productive capital, and the interest which is received on it through a loan is quite as reasonable as the annual return to the owner of productive capital. Between this theory and the theory connected with "*lucrum cessans*" the only difference is that the former shifts the justification of interest from the circumstances and rights of the lender to the present nature of the money itself. Not merely the fact that the individual will suffer if, instead of investing his money he loans it without interest, but the fact that money is generally and virtually productive, is the important element in the newer theory. In practice, however, the two explanations or justifications come to substantially the same thing.

Nevertheless, the Church has given no positive approval to any of the foregoing theories. In the last formal pronouncement by a Pope on the subject, Gregory XIV (Encyclical, "*Vix Pervenit*," 1745) condemned anew all interest that had no other support than the intrinsic conditions of the loan itself. At the same time, he declared that he had no intention of denying the lawfulness of interest which was received in virtue of the title of "*lucrum cessans*," nor the lawfulness of interest or profits arising out of investments in productive property. In other words, the authorization that he gave to both kinds of interest was merely negative. He refrained from condemning them.

In the Responses given by the Roman Congregations from 1822 onward to questions relating to the lawfulness of loan-interest, we may profitably consider four principal features. First, they declare more or less specifically that interest may be taken in the absence of the title of "*lucrum cessans*"; second, some of them definitely admit the title of "*praemium legale*," or civil authorization, as sufficient to give the practice moral sanction; third, they express a genuine permission, not a mere toleration, of interest taking; fourth, none of them explicitly declares that any of the titles or reasons for receiving loan-interest will necessarily or always give the lender a *strict right*

thereto. None of them contains a positive and reasoned approval of the practice. Most of them merely decide that persons who engage in it are not to be disturbed in conscience, so long as they stand ready to submit to a formal decision on the subject by the Holy See. The insertion of the latter condition clearly intimates that some day interest taking might be formally and officially condemned.

Should such a condemnation ever appear, it would not contradict any moral principle contained in the "Roman Responses," nor in the present attitude of the Church and of Catholic moralists. Undoubtedly it could come only as the result of a change in the organization of industry, just as the existing ecclesiastical legislation has followed the changed economic conditions since the Middle Ages.

All the theological discussion on the subject, and all the authoritative ecclesiastical declarations indicate, therefore, that interest on loans is today regarded as lawful because a loan is the economic equivalent of an investment. Evidently this is good logic and common sense. If it is right for the stockholder of a railway to receive dividends, it is equally right for the bondholder to receive interest. If it is right for a merchant to take from the gross returns of his business a sum sufficient to cover interest on his capital, it is equally right for the man from whom he has borrowed money for the enterprise to exact interest. The money in a loan is economically equivalent to, convertible into, concrete capital. It deserves, therefore, the same treatment and the same rewards. The fact that the investor undergoes a greater risk than the lender, and the fact that the former often performs labor in connection with the operation of his capital, have no bearing on the moral problem; for the investor is repaid for his extra risk and labor by the profits which he receives, and which the lender does not receive. As a mere recipient of interest, the investor undergoes no more risk nor exertion than does the lender. His claim to interest is no better than that of the latter.

On what ground does the Church or Catholic theological opinion justify interest on invested capital? on the shares of

the stockholders in corporations? on the capital of the merchant and the manufacturer?

In the early Middle Ages the only recognized titles to gain from the ownership of property were labor and risk (Cf. St. Thomas, "Summa Theologica," 2a 2ae, q. 78, a. 2 et 3; Ryan, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, eq.). Down to the beginning of the fifteenth century substantially all the incomes of all classes could be explained and justified by one or other of these two titles; for the amount of capital in existence was inconsiderable, and the number of large personal incomes insignificant.

When, however, the traffic in rent charges and the operation of partnerships, especially the "contractus trinus," or triple contract, had become fairly common, it was obvious that the profits from these practices could not be correctly attributed to either labor or risk. The person who bought, not the land itself, but the right to receive a portion of the rent thereof, and the person who became the silent member of a partnership, evidently performed no labor beyond that involved in making the contract. And their profits clearly exceeded a fair compensation for their risks, inasmuch as the profits produced a steady income. How then were they to be justified?

A few authorities maintained that such incomes had no justification. In the thirteenth century Henry of Ghent condemned the traffic in rent charges; in the sixteenth Dominicus Soto maintained that the returns to the silent partner in an enterprise ought not to exceed a fair equivalent for his risk; about the same time Pope Sixtus V denounced the triple contract as a form of usury. Nevertheless, the great majority of writers admitted that all these transactions were morally lawful, and the gains therefrom just. For a time these writers employed merely negative and *a pari* arguments. Gains from rent charges, they pointed out, were essentially as illicit as the net rent received by the owner of the land; and the interest received by a silent partner, even in a triple contract, had quite as sound a moral basis as rent charges. By the beginning of the seventeenth century the leading authorities were basing their defense of industrial interest on positive grounds. Lugo,

Lessius, and Molina adduced the productivity of capital goods as a sufficient reason for allowing gains to the investor. Whether they regarded productivity as of itself a sufficient justification of interest, or merely as a necessary condition supplementing the fact that interest was socially useful, cannot be determined with certainty.

Today most Catholic writers seem to look upon a formal defence of interest on capital as unnecessary. They seem to think that interest is justified by the mere productivity of capital. The Church has never formally approved this view. While she permits and authorizes interest, she does not define its precise moral basis.

So much for the teaching of ethical and ecclesiastical and ethical authorities. What are the objective reasons in favor of the capitalist's claim to interest? We consider here only the intrinsic reasons, those arising entirely out of the relations between the interest-receiver and the interest-payer. In the next article we shall deal with the *social* grounds of interest on capital.

Who pays the interest to the capitalist? In one sense it is the consumer, for he provides ultimately the fund out of which all the agents of production receive their shares of the product. On the other hand, the Socialists assure us that interest is appropriated by the capitalist from the product of labor. Neither is strictly adequate. In fact, no categorical answer is possible. Everything depends upon the modifications of the present system which we regard as normal or feasible. While it is true to say that the product of industry is now distributed among four agents of production, landlords, capitalists, undertakers and laborers, it does not follow that an increase or a decrease in the share of one agent would all be subtracted from or added to the shares of the other agents. The change might be made in such a way that the loss or gain would be participated in by the State or by the consumer. For example, if land were taxed at its full rental value the disappearing share of landowner would go directly to the State, not to any of the other three agents of production. The latter would benefit only in-

directly, as members of the civil community. In attempting to answer the question before us, we may profitably consider two situations, according as we assume that interest is abolished with or without a preceding change in wages.

Any rise in wages which is sufficient to cause a rise in the price of commodities will, of course, lessen the net gain going to the consumer from the subsequent abolition of interest. Thus, if the remuneration of all the laborers who are now receiving less than living wages were raised to that level, there would undoubtedly occur some increase in the price of products. Consequently the reduction in prices which would follow the cessation of interest would not be as great as it would have been had these preceding increase in wages not taken place. But there would in all probability be some reduction. Assuming that a living wage for all workers is the normal condition, we can say that interest is today paid in part by the laborer and in part by the consumer. However, we may go further, and assume that completely just wages for all the working class would mean a considerably greater increase of remuneration than that just supposed. If this were brought about it might very well happen that the gain to the consumer from the subsequent abolition of interest would only just offset the previous increase in prices. In other words, prices would be back at the present level. From this point of view, we see that all interest is now paid by the laborer.

On the other hand, if interest were abolished without any previous rise in wages, the lion's share of the benefit would go to the consumer. In all competitive industries the efforts of business men to make larger sales would cause a considerable reduction in prices. Only the benevolence of some employers, and the alertness of organized labor would prevent the consumer from getting the whole of the commuted interest. In monopolistic industries the laborers might get somewhat more than in those subject to competition. From this point of view, we can see the greater part of interest is now paid by the consumer.

Fortunately the question whether interest is paid by the la-



borer or by the consumer, has no important bearing upon the question of its intrinsic justification. It is true, as we shall see hereafter, that the laborer's right to decent wages is superior to the capitalist's right to interest, but this principle affects only the relative strength of the latter right, not its very existence. So far as the morality of interest is based upon intrinsic grounds, it is determined exclusively by what the capitalist is and does, not by the industrial function of those who pay the interest.

The intrinsic or individual grounds upon which the capitalist's right to interest has been defended are mainly three: productivity, service, and abstinence. We shall consider them in this order.

It is sometimes assumed that the claim of the capitalist to interest is quite as good as that of the owner of an animal to its offspring. Both, we are assured, are the products of the owner's property. In two respects, however, the comparison is inadequate, and somewhat misleading. Since the owner of a female animal contributes labor or money or both toward her care during the period of gestation, his claim to the offspring is based in part at least upon those titles, and only in part upon the title of interest. In the second place, the offspring is the definite and easily distinguishable product of its parent. But the sixty dollars obtained as interest on ten shares of railway stock cannot be identified as the exact product of one thousand dollars worth of railway property. It is impossible to know whether this amount of capital has contributed more, or less, than the sixty dollars of value to the joint product of the factors of production which are necessary to the creation of railway services. A similar statement will be true of any other share or piece of concrete capital. We know only that the interest received by the capitalist, be it five, six, seven, or some other per cent., measures the share of the product which capital commands for its owner in the present conditions of industry. It is the conventional not the actual product of capital.

Another faulty analogy is that drawn between the productivity of capital and the productivity of labor. Following the terminology of the economists, most persons think of land,

labor, and capital as productive in the same sense. Hence the productivity of capital is easily assumed to have the same moral value as the productive action of human beings; and the right of the capitalist to a part of the product is put on the same moral basis as the right of the laborer. Yet the differences between the two kinds of productivity, and between the two moral claims to the product are more important than their resemblances.

In the first place, there is an essential physical difference. As an instrument of production, labor is active, capital is passive. As regards its worth or dignity, labor is the expenditure of human energy, the output of a *person*, while capital is a material thing, standing apart from a personality, and possessing no human quality or human worth. These significant intrinsic or physical differences forbid any immediate inference that the moral claims of the owners of capital and labor are equally valid. We should logically expect to find that their moral claims are unequal.

This expectation is realized when we examine the bearing of the two kinds of productivity upon human welfare. In the exercise of productive effort the average laborer undergoes a sacrifice. He is engaged in a process that is ordinarily irksome. To require from him this toilsome expenditure of energy without compensation, would make him a mere instrument of his fellows. It would subordinate him and his comfort to the aggrandizement of beings who are not his superiors but his moral equals. For he is a person; they are no more than persons. On the other hand, the capitalist as such, as the recipient of interest, performs no labor, painful or otherwise. Not the capitalist but capital participates in the productive process. Even though the capitalist should receive no interest, the productive functioning of capital would not subordinate him to his fellows in the way that wageless labor would subordinate the laborer.

The precise and fundamental reason for according to the laborer his product is that this is the only rational rule of distribution. When a man makes a useful thing out of materials that are his, he has a strict right to the product simply because

there is no other reasonable method of distributing the goods and opportunities of the earth. If another individual, or society, were permitted to take this product, industry would be discouraged, idleness fostered, and reasonable life and self-development rendered impossible. Direful consequences of this magnitude would not follow the abolition of interest.

Perhaps the most important difference between the moral claims of capitalist and laborer is the fact that for the latter labor is the sole means of livelihood. Unless he is compensated for his product he will perish. But the capitalist has in addition to the interest that he receives the ability to work. Were interest abolished he would still be in as good a position as the laborer. The product of the laborer means to him the necessities of life; the product of the capitalist means to him goods in excess of a mere livelihood. Consequently their claims to the product are greatly unequal in vital importance and moral value.

The foregoing considerations show that even the claim of the laborer to his product is not based upon merely intrinsic grounds. It does not spring entirely from the mere fact that he has produced the product, from the mere relation between producer and thing produced. If this is true of labor-productivity we should expect to find it even more evident with regard to the productivity of capital; for the latter is passive instead of active, non-rational instead of human.

The expectation is well founded. Not a single conclusive argument can be brought forward to show that the productivity of capital directly and necessarily confers upon the capitalist a right to the interest-product. All the attempted arguments are reducible to two formulas: "*res fructificat domino*" ("a thing fructifies to its owner") and "the effect follows its cause." The first of these was originally a legal rather than an ethical maxim; a rule by which the title was determined in the civil law, not a principle by which the right was determined in morals. The second is an irrelevant platitude. As a juristic principle, neither is self evident. Why should the owner of a piece of capital, be it a house, a machine, or a share of railway stock, have a right to its product, when he has expended neither time, labor, money, nor inconvenience of any kind?

To answer, "because the thing which produced the product belongs to him," is merely to beg the question. To answer, "because the effect follows the cause," is to make a statement which may or may not be true, but which has nothing to do with the question. What we want to know is why the ownership of a productive thing gives a right to the product; why this particular effect should follow its cause in this particular way. To answer by repeating under the guise of sententious formulas the thesis that is to be proved, is scarcely satisfactory or convincing. To answer that if the capitalist were not given interest industry and thrift would decrease and human welfare suffer, is to abandon the intrinsic argument entirely. It brings in the extrinsic consideration of social consequences.

The second intrinsic ground upon which interest is defended, is the *service* performed by the capitalist when he permits his capital to be used in production. Without capital, laborers and consumers would be unable to command more than a fraction of their present means of livelihood. From this point of view we see that the service in question is worth all that is paid in the form of interest. Nevertheless it does not follow that the capitalist has a claim in strict justice to any payment for this service. According to St. Thomas, a seller may not charge a buyer an extra amount merely because of the extra value attached to the community by the latter. ("Secunda Secundae," q. 77, a. 1, in corp.). In other words, a man cannot justly be required to pay an unusual price for a benefit or advantage or service when the seller undergoes no unusual privation. Father Lehmkuhl carries the principle farther, and declares that the seller has a right to compensation only when and to the extent that he undergoes a privation or undertakes a responsibility ("Theologia Moralis," I, no. 1050). According to this rule, the capitalist would have no right to interest; for as mere interest-receiver he undergoes no privation. His risk and labor are remunerated in profits, while the responsibility of not withdrawing from production something that can continue in existence only by continuing in production, is scarcely deserving of a reward according to the canons of strict justice.

Whatever we may think of this argument from authority,

we find it impossible to prove objectively that a man who renders a service to another has an intrinsic right to anything beyond compensation for the expenditure of money or labor involved in performing the service. The man who throws a life preserver to a drowning person may justly demand a payment for his trouble. On any recognized basis of compensation, this payment will not exceed a few dollars. Yet the man whose life is in danger would pay a million dollars for this service if he were extremely rich. He would regard the service as worth this much to him. Has the man with the life preserver a right to exact such a payment? Has he the right to demand the full value of the service? No reasonable person would answer this question otherwise than in the negative. If the performer of the service may not charge the full value thereof, as measured by the estimate put upon it by the recipient, it would seem that he ought not to demand anything in excess of a fair price for his trouble. In other words, he may not justly exact anything for the service as such.

It would seem, then, that the capitalist has no moral claim to pure interest on the mere ground that the use of his capital in production constitutes a service to laborers and consumers. It would seem that he has no right to demand a payment for a costless service.

The third and last of the intrinsic justifications of interest that we shall consider is *abstinence*. This argument is based upon the contention that the person who saves his money, and invests it in the instruments of production undergoes a sacrifice in deferring to the future satisfactions that he might enjoy today. One hundred dollars now is worth as much as one hundred and five dollars a year hence. That is, when both are estimated from the viewpoint of the present. This sacrifice of present to future enjoyment which contributes a service to the community in the form of capital, creates a just claim upon the community to compensation in the form of interest. If the capitalist is not rewarded for this inconvenience he is, like the unpaid laborer, subordinated to the aggrandizement of his fellows.

Against this argument we may place the extreme refutation attempted by the Socialist leader, Ferdinand Lassalle:

"But the profit of capital is *the reward of abstinence*. Truly a happy phrase. European millionaires are ascetics, Indian penitents, modern St. Simons Stylites, who, perched on their columns, with withered features and arms and bodies thrust forward, hold out a plate to the passers-by that they may receive the wages of their privations! In the midst of this sacrosanct group, high above his fellow-mortifiers of the flesh, stands the Holy House of Rothschild. That is the real truth about our present society! How could I have hitherto blundered on this point as I have?" ("What is Capital?" p. 27).

Obviously this a marvelously one-sided implication concerning the sources of capital. But it is scarcely less adequate than the explanation in opposition to which it has been quoted. Both fail to distinguish between the different kinds of savers, the different kinds of capital-owners. For the purpose of our inquiry savings must be divided into three classes.

First, those which are accumulated and invested automatically. Very rich persons save a great deal of money that they have no desire to spend, since they have already satisfied or safeguarded all the wants of which they are conscious. Evidently this kind of saving involves no real sacrifice. To it the words of Lassalle are substantially applicable, and the claim to interest for abstinence decidedly inapplicable.

Second, savings to provide for old age and other future contingencies which are estimated as more important than any of the purposes for which the money might now be expended. Were interest abolished this kind of saving would be even greater than it is at present; for a larger total would be required to equal the fund that is now provided through the addition of interest to the principal. In a no-interest regime one thousand dollars would have to be set aside every year in order to total twenty thousand dollars in twenty years; when interest is accumulated on the savings, a smaller annual amount will suffice to produce the same fund. Inasmuch as this class of persons would save in an even greater degree without interest,

it is clear that they regard the sacrifice involved as fully compensated in the resulting provision for the future. In their case sacrifice is amply rewarded by accumulation. Their claim to additional compensation in the form of interest does not seem to have any valid basis. In the words of the late Professor Devas, "there is ample reward given without any need of any interest or dividend. For the workers with heads or hands keep the property intact, ready for the owner to consume whenever convenient, when he gets infirm or sick, or when his children have grown up, and can enjoy the property with him" ("Political Economy," p. 507).

The third kind of saving is that which is made by persons who could spend and have some desire to spend, more on present satisfactions, and who have already provided for all future wants in accordance with the standards of necessities and comforts that they have adopted. Their fund for the future is already sufficient to meet all those needs which seem weightier than their present unsatisfied wants. If the surplus in question is saved it will go to supply future desires which are no more important than those for which it might be expended now. In other words, the alternatives before the prospective saver are to procure a given amount of satisfaction today, or to defer the same degree of satisfaction to a distant day.

In this case the inducement of interest will undoubtedly be necessary to bring about saving. As between equal amounts of satisfaction at different times, the average person will certainly prefer those of the present to those of the future. He will not decide in favor of the future unless the satisfactions then obtainable are to be greater in quantity. To this situation the rule that deferred enjoyments are worth less than present enjoyments, is strictly applicable. The increased quantity of future satisfaction which is necessary to turn the choice from the present to the future, and to determine that the surplus shall be saved rather than spent, can be provided only through interest. In this way the accumulations of interest and savings will make the future fund equivalent to a larger amount of enjoyment or utility than could be obtained if the surplus were exchanged

for the goods of the present. "Interest magnifies the distant object." Whenever this magnifying power seems sufficiently great to outweigh the advantage of present over future satisfactions, the surplus will be saved instead of spent.

Among the well-to-do there is probably a considerable number of persons who take this attitude toward a considerable part of their savings. Since they would not make these savings without the inducement of interest, they regard the latter as a necessary compensation for the sacrifice of postponed enjoyment. In a general way we may say that they have a strict right to this interest on the intrinsic ground of sacrifice. Inasmuch as the community benefits by the savings, it may quite as fairly be required to pay for the antecedent sacrifices of the savers as for the inconvenience undergone by the performer of any other useful labor or service. To be sure, the community could abolish interest without violating this particular right to interest; for the persons in question would already have received compensation for the sacrifices of past saving, and could refrain from further saving of this kind; but so long as they continue to save solely for the sake of the interest that they receive, their title to the latter is just.

Summing up the matter regarding the intrinsic justification of interest, we find that the titles of productivity and service do not conclusively establish the strict right of the capitalist to interest, and that the title of abstinence is morally valid for only a portion, probably a rather small portion of the total amount of interest now received by the owners of capital. Consequently interest as a whole is not justified on individual grounds. If it is to be proved morally lawful its justification must be sought in extrinsic and social considerations. This inquiry will form the subject of a second article.

JOHN A. RYAN.

THE ST. PAUL SEMINARY.



## THE MALTHUSIAN PRINCIPLE OF POPULATION.

---

The Malthusian doctrine, which undertakes to state the relation between increasing food supply and increasing population, and the means by which that relation is maintained, was long the bulwark behind which reactionaries in England took their stand to beat off the attacks of reform. "We want higher wages," said the workers. "You cannot by any possibility get them so long as your numbers continue to increase," answered the propertied classes. "Your low wages are due to no fault of ours or of the state's, but to your own imprudence." Malthusianism, interpreted in this way, was a balm to the consciences of the well-to-do classes, but it made political economy the dismal science.

Certain zealous but misguided reformers accepted the prevailing version of Malthusianism and recommended to the workers a course of conduct intended for their material well being, but in violation of the principles of morality. A new storm of disapproval arose. The Malthusian doctrine was now not only an object of controversy between the propertied and the propertyless classes, but between the moralists and the immoral reformers as well.

Malthus's essay has been refuted, it is said, more often than any other economic work. And yet, many of the foremost economists profess themselves followers of Malthus. The late General Walker, for example, after accepting the Malthusian doctrine of population, said (*Political Economy*, p. 313), "Mr. Malthus unquestionably committed some errors of statement and faults of reasoning in his original enunciation of the principles of population, as is likely to be the case on the first promulgations of great economic or social laws; and during his whole life he was closely followed by criticism and abuse. Since Mr. Malthus's death has taken all personal interest out of the controversy over the principles of population, and Malthusianism has come to be merely a name for a body of

doctrine, the views here presented have been a butt for the headless arrows of beginners in economics and of sundry sentimental sociologists."

Professor Taussig in his recent work (*Principles of Economics*, p. 210), likewise tones down and accepts Malthus. "Some parts of Malthus's teaching have been sustained by the course of thought since his time. Man is an animal, physiologically like any other; and the possibilities of his increase in numbers are as unlimited as they are for any other form of life. It is an odd circumstance that Darwin, reading Malthus's Essay, was led to the reflection that not man only, but any sort of creature, has the possibility of indefinite increase; and hence reached the conclusion that there is an increasing struggle for room and sustenance, and a survival of those best able to cope with their surroundings. Darwin's own wider conclusion, then, reinforced Malthus's views as to the human species." And later on Taussig adds, "The tendency towards increase in population must then be counteracted; and it may be counteracted in two ways, to which Malthus gave the names positive and preventive checks. By positive checks he meant those which cut down numbers already brought into the world,—starvation, disease, war, misery in all its forms. By preventive checks he meant those which prevent numbers from being brought into the world."

Many Catholic writers are disposed to hold Malthus responsible for the immoral interpretation placed upon his writings by certain of his followers; and even where they do not press this responsibility, they are not as much inclined as the economists above quoted, to tolerate the evident mistakes in Malthus's Essay, and to give him credit for what is sound. Father Schrijvers, after discussing the economic side of the question, takes up the moral phase. "As to the *remedies advised* by Malthus," he says, "for this economic state of things, so disastrous to the future of humanity, they are inadmissible. . . . Now an economic doctrine that leads to the violation of the rules of morality is false."

Malthusianism was in the beginning a protest against economic optimism, and it is not strange that economic optimism

continues to oppose it. If misery and want are due, as many reformers insist, to injustice in the distribution of wealth, and not at all to the niggardliness of nature, then it is incorrect to say with Malthus that nature, through the scantiness of her gifts, sets bounds to the numbers of population. Henry George represents this view. "I go to the heart of the matter," he says, "in saying that there is no warrant, either in experience or analogy, for the assumption that there is any tendency in population to increase faster than subsistence." And again he writes, "Nor what Malthus failed to show has any one since him shown. The globe may be surveyed and history may be reviewed in vain for any instance of a considerable country in which poverty and want can be fairly attributed to the pressure of an increasing population."

It is the purpose of the writer in the following pages to examine this much debated principle of population, giving (I) an outline of the main features of the Malthusian principle, and some account of the sources from which Malthus derived his views, and (II) a critical estimate of the theory and of its importance in so far as it is valid.

## I.

In 1798, Thomas Robert Malthus, an Anglican clergyman, published anonymously "An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it affects the Future Improvement of Society. With Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and Other Writers." The preface to the first edition of the essay states that "the following essay owes its origin to a conversation with a friend on the subject of Mr. Godwin's Essay, on avarice and profusion, in his Enquirer. The discussion started the general question of the future improvement of society; and the author at first sat down with an intention of merely stating his thoughts to his friend, upon paper, in a clearer manner than he thought he could do in conversation. But as the subject opened upon him, some ideas occurred, which he did not recollect to have met with before; and as he conceived that every, the least light, on a topic so generally

interesting, might be received with candour, he determined to put his thoughts in a form for publication." The friend of whom he speaks in the preface was his father, the literary executor of Rousseau and the friend of Godwin. The first edition of the essay was intended to be a refutation of Godwin's argument for the perfectibility of mankind. The second edition was published in 1803 under the author's name and was called "An Essay on the Principle of Population; or, a view of its past and present effects on human happiness; with an inquiry into our prospects respecting the future removal or mitigation of the evils which it occasions. A New Edition, Very Much Enlarged." There were in all, six editions of the Essay published during Malthus's life and in the case of each new edition some revision was made. The first essay was extremely pessimistic in tone in answer to the extreme optimism of Godwin. The later editions were less extreme and left more room for a hopeful view of the future.

Godwin held that the evil in the world is essentially the result of human institutions. By establishing equality among men, by training men to use their reason and by abolishing evil laws and institutions, Godwin would usher in the day when all would be happy, and all would have leisure in which to develop their moral and intellectual powers. Malthus considered Godwin's presentation of the matter a beautiful dream which he would like to see realized but which was impossible of realization because of qualities inherent in the nature of man. Godwin in speaking of population says, "There is a principle in human society, by which population is perpetually kept down to the level of the means of subsistence. Thus among the wandering tribes of America, and Asia, we never find through the lapse of ages that population has so increased as to render necessary the cultivation of the earth." Godwin did not further investigate this principle, but Malthus did, and professed to find in it the reason why Godwin's dream could not come true. "This principle of population," said Malthus, "will be found to be the grinding law of necessity; misery and the fear of misery."

It is this principle of population which is the theme of the

Essay. Roughly stated, Malthus's contention is as follows: The power of population is greater than the power in the earth to furnish subsistence for men. Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio. By the law of our nature that makes food necessary for men, the effects of these two unequal powers must be kept equal. This implies a strong and constantly operating check on population from the difficulty of subsistence. Through the animal and vegetable kingdoms, nature has scattered the seeds of life abroad with the most profuse and liberal hand. She has been comparatively sparing in the room, and the nourishment necessary to rear them. The germs of existence contained in one spot of earth, with ample food and ample room to expand in, would fill millions of worlds in the course of a few thousand years. Necessity, that imperious, all-pervading law of nature, restrains them within the prescribed bounds. The race of plants and the race of animals shrink under this great restrictive law. And the race of man cannot, by any efforts of reason, escape from it. Among plants and animals its effects are waste of seed, sickness, and premature death, among mankind, misery and vice. The former, misery, is an absolutely necessary consequence of it. Vice is a highly probable consequence, and we therefore see it abundantly prevail; but it ought not, perhaps, to be called an absolutely necessary consequence since it is the part of virtue to resist all temptation to evil.

This natural inequality in the two powers of population and of production in the earth, together with the fact that the two inequalities must be kept equal, *i. e.*, that man cannot live without food, form the insurmountable difficulty in the way of the perfectibility of society in which Godwin believed.

Population when unchecked increases in a geometrical ratio and subsistence in an arithmetical ratio. In the United States of America, where the means of subsistence have been more ample, the manners of the people more pure, and consequently the checks to early marriages fewer, than in any of the modern states of Europe, the population was found, according to the best of Malthus's information, to double itself in twenty-five

years. This ratio of increase, though short of the utmost power of population to reproduce itself, was taken as the standard from which to reckon. Population, then, goes on doubling itself every twenty-five years, when unchecked, *i. e.*, it increases in geometrical ratio.

Now consider the possibility of the increase of food: Take any spot of earth, Great Britain, for instance, and see in what ratio the subsistence it affords can be supposed to increase, beginning with it under its present state of cultivation.

If I allow, says Malthus, that by the best possible policy, by breaking up more land, and by great encouragements to agriculture, the produce of this island may be doubled in the first twenty-five years, I think it will be allowing as much as any person can well demand.

In the next twenty-five years, it is impossible to suppose that the produce could be quadrupled. It would be contrary to all our knowledge of the qualities of land. The very utmost that we can conceive, is, that the increase in the second twenty-five years might equal the present produce. Let us then take this for our rule, though certainly far beyond the truth; and allow that by great exertion, the whole produce of the Island, might be increased every twenty-five years, by a quantity of subsistence equal to what it at present produces. The most enthusiastic speculator cannot suppose a greater increase than this. In a few centuries it would make every acre of land in the Island like a garden. Yet this ratio of increase is evidently arithmetical.

Supposing we could have these two ratios of increase without check, the human species would increase in the ratio of—1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, etc., and the subsistence as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, etc. In two centuries and a quarter the population would be to the means of subsistence as 512 to 10; in three centuries, as 4096 to 13; and in two thousand years the difference would be almost incalculable, though the produce in that time would have increased to an immense extent.

Of course it is out of the question that population should thus increase out of proportion to the increase of the means of sub-

sistence. Accordingly Malthus undertakes to examine the checks which keep population from increasing so rapidly. He first discusses the check on the lower forms of life. Among plants and animals, he says, the view of the subject is simple. They are all impelled by a powerful instinct to the increase of their species; and this instinct is interrupted by no reasoning, or doubts about providing for their offspring. Wherever there is liberty, therefore, the power of increase is exerted; and the superabundant effects are repressed afterwards by want of room and nourishment, which is common to animals and plants; and among animals, by becoming the prey of others.

The effects of this check on man are more complicated. Impelled to the increase of his species by an equally powerful instinct, reason interrupts his career, and asks him whether he may not bring beings into the world, for whom he cannot provide the means of subsistence. In a state where all men might enjoy equally the fruits of the earth, this would be a simple question. In the present state of society other considerations occur. Will he not lower his rank in life? Will he not subject himself to greater difficulties than he at present feels? Will he not be obliged to labor harder, and if he has a large family, will his utmost exertions enable him to support them? May he not see his offspring in rags and misery, and clamoring for bread that he cannot give them? And may he not be reduced to the grating necessity of forfeiting his independence, and being obliged to the sparing hand of charity for support? These considerations are calculated to prevent, and certainly do prevent, a very great number in all civilized nations from pursuing the dictates of nature in an early attachment to one woman. And this restraint almost necessarily, though not absolutely, produces vice. Yet in all societies, even those that are most vicious, the tendency to a virtuous attachment is so strong that there is a constant effort towards the increase of population. The result of this tendency means increased consumption of food in that society and therefore constantly tends to subject the lower classes of the society to distress, and to prevent any great permanent amelioration of their condition.

Malthus concludes that the superior power of population cannot be checked without producing misery or vice, and Godwin's argument of the perfectibility of man is no longer tenable. At any rate, that was Malthus's conclusion in the first edition of the Essay. Later editions show a modification of this opinion.

The second and succeeding editions of the Essay differed, in important respects from the first edition. The later editions contained much material gathered from the different quarters of the earth to show the conditions under which population had actually increased. This material was not, however, essential to the argument, and may be neglected. The most important changes were that the Essay ceased to be mainly a refutation of Godwinism and that it introduced a new check on population. The checks of the first Essay, were vice and misery; in the later editions there was added the check of moral restraint. Malthus explains this term as follows: "It will be observed that I here use the term *moral* in its most confined sense. By moral restraint I would be understood to mean a restraint from marriage from prudential motives, with a conduct strictly moral during this period of restraint; and I have never intentionally deviated from this sense. When I have wished to consider the restraint from marriage unconnected with its consequences, I have either called it prudential restraint, or a part of the preventive check, of which indeed it forms the principal branch. . . . In my review of the different stages of society, I have been accused of not allowing sufficient weight in the prevention of population to moral restraint; but when the confined sense of the term, which I have here explained, is adverted to, I am fearful that I shall not be found to have erred much in this respect. I should be glad to believe myself mistaken."

Malthus also has another classification of checks on population, viz., the positive and the preventive. Positive checks are those which cut down an existing population and preventive checks are those arising from man's calculation of future consequences which do not allow so large a number of births as there would be if a man followed his animal instincts alone.



The preventive checks may be either moral or immoral. It has been unfortunate for Malthus's memory that a group of persons calling themselves neo-Malthusians and advocating preventive checks of an immoral nature, have been able to mislead the public as to what he really taught. Malthus never advocated checks of an immoral nature.

Malthus appeared in England at a time when a pessimistically colored explanation of the principle of population was likely to be received with favor. The population of England had been increasing rapidly. In 1700 it was in the neighborhood of five millions; in 1750, six and a half millions; and in 1800, nine millions; while in the next fifty years it doubled itself. For the first three quarters of the eighteenth century, England's food production was able to maintain the home population and to furnish a surplus for shipment abroad. For another decade or two, the balance between home supply of food and demand remained nearly equal; while beginning in the last decade of the eighteenth it became necessary to get larger shipments of grain abroad. The burden caused by this necessity of going to foreign markets for food was accentuated by several successive crop failures and by the weight of foreign war. At the same time the industrial revolution which was under way, had worked great hardship to the craftsmen of the earlier generation, inasmuch as they were unable to fit themselves into the new system. The new factories were able to use cheap child- and woman-labor, and when men were employed, it was often at less than a living wage; and the poor rates were beginning to take the place of wages. The result of all these conditions was a wide-spread pauperization of the laboring classes, and so under these circumstances, a pessimistic philosophy of population was well-timed.

In the preface to the second edition of the "Essay," Malthus discusses his sources. The "Essay on the Principle of Population," which was published in 1798, was suggested, he says, by a paper in Mr. Godwin's "Enquirer." The only authors from whom he deduced the principle which formed the main arguments of the essay were Hume, Wallace, Dr. Adam Smith, and Dr. Price. Before getting out the second edition of the

essay he had gone more deeply into the literature of population and had become acquainted with the writings on the subject by some of the physiocrats and with those of Montesquieu, Dr. Franklin, Sir James Steuart, Mr. Arthur Young, and Mr. Townsend. Much had been written on the subject and looking into the situation Malthus was a little surprised that what had been written was so little known. In fact, practically everything of importance that Malthus had said in his essay had been said once or many times by previous writers, but Malthus put the case in a more striking way, presented it with more conviction and at a time when social conditions were such that people were more likely to pay attention to it. He gives his own idea of his contribution in the following language: "Independently of the comparison between the increase of population and food, which had not perhaps been stated with sufficient force and precision; some of the most curious and interesting parts of the subject had been either wholly omitted or treated very slightly. Though it had been stated distinctly, that population must always be kept down to the level of the means of subsistence; yet few inquiries had been made into the various modes by which this level is effected; and the principle had never been sufficiently pursued to its consequences: and those practical inferences drawn from it, which a strict examination of its effects on society seems to suggest." The judgment of the world is likely to be, however, that Malthus overestimated the importance of the new matter which he had contributed. A few extracts from some of his predecessors will show that the matter was pretty well understood before his time. First let us call as witnesses the authors whom he had read before the publication of the first edition.

David Hume and Robert Wallace were interested in the question of the relative numbers of people in ancient and in modern times, the former holding that the ancients were less numerous, the latter that they were more numerous than the moderns. Both were acquainted with the problem of population, but they were not pessimistic as to its outcome. Hume in his *Dissertation on the "Populousness of Ancient Nations,"* published in 1753, devotes much space to a discussion of the

checks on increase of population, enumerating among them disease and vice, slavery and war. Concerning the tendency to increase, Hume says: "For as there is in all men, both male and female, a desire and power of generation, more active than is ever universally exerted, the restraints which they lie under must proceed from some difficulties in their situation, which it belong to a wise legislation carefully to observe and remove. . . . History tells us frequently of plagues which have swept away the third or fourth part of a people; yet in a generation or two, the destruction was not perceived, and the society had again acquired their former number. The lands which were cultivated, the houses built, the commodities raised, the riches acquired, enabled the people who escaped, immediately to marry and to rear families, which supplied the place of those who had perished."

Dr. Wallace, in 1753, treated both of the geometrical rate of increase and of the checks on the increase of population. In his "Dissertation on the Numbers of Mankind in Ancient and Modern Times" he first makes the assumption that "every marriage produces six children, three males and as many females; two of whom, *viz.*, one male and one female, die in the more early seasons of life, or before marriage: according to which four will remain to marry, and to replenish the world. That in  $33\frac{1}{3}$  years from the time when this original pair began to propagate, they shall have produced their six children; and that within the second period of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  years, each of the succeeding couples shall have produced six children; and this to take place continually." According to this assumption the population would be doubled every  $33\frac{1}{3}$  years, but this, Wallace concludes, is inconsistent with fact for the reason that mankind would have overstocked the earth long before the deluge if this rate of increase had been maintained. And we read in a footnote: "It is not owing to the want of prolific virtue, but to the distressed circumstances of mankind, that every generation does not more than double themselves; for this would be the case, if every man were married at the age of puberty, and could sufficiently provide for a family."

The checks to the increase of population Wallace developed

with considerable detail. The following extracts will give an indication of his contribution to Malthus. "The causes of this paucity of inhabitants, and of this irregularity of increase, are manifold. Some of them may be called physical, as they depend entirely upon the course of nature, and are independent of mankind. Others are moral and depend on the affections, the passions, and the institutions of men. Among the physical causes some are more constant: such as the temperature of the air. . . . Other causes of this kind are more variable: such as, the inclemency of particular seasons; plagues; famines; earthquakes; and inundations of the sea. . . . Those we have called moral causes . . . arise from the passions and the vices of men . . . and have a more constant and more powerful influence on the world.

"To this last article we may refer the many destructive wars which men have waged against one another; great poverty; corrupt institutions either of a civil or of a religious kind; intemperance; debauchery; irregular amours; idleness; luxury; and whatever either prevents marriage, or weakens the generating faculties of men, or renders them either negligent or incapable of educating their children, and of cultivating the earth to advantage. . . . In every country there shall always be found a greater number of inhabitants, *caeteris paribus*, in proportion to the plenty of provisions it affords, as plenty will always encourage the generality of the people to marry."

Adam Smith recognized that the means of subsistence furnish a sort of elastic check on population. Thus, he says, (*Wealth of Nations*, I, viii, published in 1776), "A greater number of fine children, however, is seldom seen anywhere than about a barrack of soldiers. Very few of them, it seems, arrive at the age of thirteen or fourteen. In some places one half the children born die before they are four years of age; in many places before they are seven; and in almost all places before they are nine or ten. This great mortality, however, will everywhere be found chiefly among the children of the common people, who cannot afford to tend them with the same care as those of better station. Though their marriages are generally more fruitful than those of people of fashion, a smaller pro-

portion of their children arrive at maturity. . . . Every species of animals naturally multiplies in proportion to the means of their subsistence, and no species can ever multiply beyond it. But in civilized society it is only among the inferior ranks of people that the scantiness of subsistence can set limits to the further multiplication of the human species; and it can do so in no other way than by destroying a great part of the children which their fruitful marriages produce."

Richard Price in a letter written to Benjamin Franklin in 1769 alludes to the rapid rate in increase in America. This letter was known to Malthus and is to be found in the second volume of Price's *Observations on Reversionary Payments*. "Dr. Herberden," says Price, "observes that, in Madeira, the inhabitants double their own number in 84 years. But this, (as you, Sir, well know), is a very slow increase, compared with that which takes place among our colonies in America. In the back settlements, where the inhabitants apply themselves entirely to agriculture, and luxury is not known, they double their own number in 15 years; and all through the northern colonies, in 25 years. This is an instance of increase so rapid as to have scarcely any parallel."

The physiocrats with whose writings Malthus had become acquainted before the publication of the second edition had given careful thought to many phases of the population question. While Mirabeau had taken a very optimistic view of the relation between population and subsistence, Quesnay thought that population might press so closely upon subsistence as to produce misery. DuPont discussed the doubling of the population every twenty-five years in America. In general the physiocrats held that advancing civilization with its improvements and inventions makes the conditions of life easier for the increasing population.

Montesquieu devotes Book XXIII of the "Spirit of Laws" (1748) to a discussion of the question of population. After a historical survey of the laws and the conditions of ancient and modern times he says, "From all this we may conclude that Europe is at present in a condition to require laws to be made in favor of the propagation of the human species."

Benjamin Franklin, in a short essay entitled "Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries, etc.", (1751) discusses the checks upon population and concludes as follows, "There is, in short, no bound to the prolific nature of plants or animals but what is made by their crowding and interfering with each other's means of subsistence. Was the face of the earth vacant of other plants, it might be gradually sowed and overspread with one kind only; as for instance, with Fennel; and were it empty of other inhabitants, it might in a few ages be replenished from one nation only; as for instance with Englishmen. Thus there are supposed to be now upwards of one Million English souls in North America (tho' 'tis thought scarce 80,000 have been brought over sea) and yet perhaps there is not one the fewer in Britain, but rather many more, on account of the employment the colonies afford to manufacture at home. This Million doubling, suppose but once in twenty-five years, will in another century be more than the people of England, and the greatest number of Englishmen will be on this side the water. . . . Thus, if you have room and subsistence enough, as you may by dividing, make ten polypuses out of one, you may of one make ten nations, equally populous and powerful; or rather, increase a nation ten fold in numbers and strength."

Sir James Steuart in his "Principles of Political Oeconomy, etc.", (1767) compares the multiplication of the human species with that of animals and finds the situations similar. "Several kinds of animals, especially insects, multiply by thousands, and yet the species does not appear annually to increase. . . It is reasonable to conclude that what destroys such vast quantities must be among other causes, the want of food." In the case of men "the generative faculty resembles a spring with a loaded weight, which always exerts itself in proportion to the diminution of resistance; when food has remained some time without augmentation or diminution the spring is overpowered; the force of it becomes less than nothing, inhabitants will diminish at least in proportion to the overcharge. If upon the other hand food be increased the spring will exert itself in proportion as the resistance diminishes; people will begin to be

better fed; they will multiply, and in proportion as they increase in numbers, the food will become scarce again."

Arthur Young wrote in 1771 in "The Farmer's Tour through the East of England," "In spite of the assertions of all political writers for the last twenty years, who placed the prosperity of a nation in the greatest possible population, an excessive population without a great amount of work and without abundant production is a devouring surplus for a state; for this excessive population does not get the benefits of subsistence which, without this excess, they would partake of; the amount of work is not sufficient for the number of hands; and the price of work is lowered by the great competition of the laborers, from which results indigence to those who cannot find work."

Joseph Townsend writing in 1792 ("Journey through Spain") said, "There is an appetite which is, and should be, urgent but which, if left to operate without restraint would multiply the human species before provision could be made for their support. Some check, some balance, is therefore absolutely needful, and hunger is the proper balance; hunger, not as directly felt or feared by the individual for himself, but as foreseen and feared for his immediate offspring. Were it not for this, the equilibrium would not be preserved so near as it is at present, between the numbers of people and the quantity of food."

The extracts given above typify the views of the writers named by Malthus as the sources of his inspiration. There is nothing essential in his argument which is not foreshadowed by one or more of them. Many other writers from Plato and Aristotle down to his own time had gone over this same ground more or less thoroughly. But for the most part the earlier writers on population looked upon the tendency of increasing numbers with satisfaction rather than with fear. Here was for them the means of making good the losses caused by famine and war rather than the cause of vice and misery. And especially with the growth of modern nations, statesmen were inclined to consider and to encourage the numbers of potential soldiers. There were not wanting, however, writers who took

the opposed view. We cannot refrain from calling attention to one of these, the Italian Ortes, whose work on population published eight years before that of Malthus and in certain respects superior to the Essay, was unknown to the English divine.

Giammaria Ortes<sup>1</sup> was a native of Venice and there entered the Camaldolese order where he took vows. Later, upon the death of his father and at the earnest solicitation of his mother he withdrew from the order and devoted himself to the management of the family fortune. His later life was given over to a wide range of study and he published upon a number of varied subjects. His economic doctrines were marked by originality, and he delighted in attacking the received economic opinion of his day. He died in 1790 at the age of seventy-seven. He develops his views on population in his "*Economia nazionale*" and especially in the "*Riflessioni sulla popolazione della nazioni par rapporto all' Economia nazionale*," published in 1790.

According to Ortes, man's power of increase is unlimited. He illustrates this by supposing a group of seven persons composed of a grand-parent, two parents, and two young men and two young women twenty years old. The two young couples marry and there are born to each couple an average of six children, of whom two die before reaching the age of twenty. Their great-grandfather also dies. Thirty years after the marriage of the first two couples, there will remain alive the two parents mentioned in the original group of seven, the two young couples of that period and eight children, or a total of fourteen. If this cycle is repeated every thirty years, the population will be at the end of the second period of thirty years, twenty-eight; at the end of the third thirty year period, fifty-six, at the end of the fourth period, one hundred twelve; and at the end of the fifth period, or one hundred fifty years after the marriage of the two original couples, two hundred twenty-four. This is Malthus's geometrical progression with the

<sup>1</sup>The account of Ortes here given is based upon that of Reynaud in "*La Theorie de la Population en Italie du XVIe au XVIIIe Siècle*."



difference that Malthus assumed that population might double every twenty-five years. Ortes continues his progression with the result that he finds that at the end of seven hundred fifty years the original group of seven had become 234,881,024, and a hundred and fifty years later 7,516,192,768. But according to Ortes, the earth can support only three billions of inhabitants. The original group of seven would thus in about eight hundred years reach the limit permitted by the productive powers of the earth. Ortes differs from Malthus in thinking of the limit of the supply of food as being rigid, whereas Malthus considered it somewhat elastic and believed that with the passing of time, the food supply could be increased. On the other hand, Ortes did not consider that the number of inhabitants would actually increase to three billions. Inequalities in the distribution of wealth, he thought, would keep the population down very considerably. He estimated the actual population of the world to be in the neighborhood of one billion and he thought it was held down to this number by the avarice of the wealthy who did not wish to have their property divided among many children and who by depriving the poor of their share of the national income, kept from them the means of rearing their children. When a population has nearly reached the limits set by the size and wealth of its territory it may become stationary in numbers, provided that the number of persons who marry is equalled by the number who remain single. And Ortes would advise celibacy to overcome the evils which arise from overpopulation. Only Catholics, he says, teach that celibacy is a virtue. It alone restricts suitably the numbers of marriages and hinders extreme poverty and excess of population. Without celibacy, the human species falls to the level of the brute. Like Malthus, Ortes discusses the checks upon increase among animals and among men, but he gives man more credit for a right use of his reason in the matter than does Malthus.

Malthus and his disciples used his theory as a justification and an argument for the hard-heartedness of the wealthy towards the poor. The poverty of the poor was due to their own folly, said Malthus, and it would not mend matters for the

wealthy to divide their goods with the less fortunate. Ortes, on the other hand, was filled with Christian charity and held that a more equal distribution of wealth would help to relieve a relative over-population.

The "principle of population" states what Malthus believed to be true with regard to the respective tendencies to increase of population and subsistence. It is not a statement of what he wished true in this regard. He would have liked to take, with Godwin, an optimistic view of the future of society, but he was convinced that the facts in the case would not warrant such a view. In the first edition he had no recommendations to make for the purpose of enabling society to escape the consequences of the "principle of population"; in the second and later editions he advocated "moral restraint" as a means of escape from the hardship resulting from the "principle." The question to be decided, then, in connection with Malthus's doctrine is not whether it is moral or immoral, but rather whether it is true or false, or rather to what extent it is true and to what extent false, and whether there are not counteracting tendencies which render Malthus's principle of little or no practical importance at the present time. These questions will be taken up in a later paper.

FRANK O'HARA.

## THE PERSONALITY OF FRANCIS THOMPSON.

---

At last the world knows the complete story of Francis Thompson, whose life, edited by Everard Meynell, the son of his benefactor, has recently appeared. While it gives a more detailed account of the poet, it serves mainly to confirm impressions already known to the public through notices and memoirs contributed by his friends. It must have been the desire of his readers to possess a definitive portrait of him "in his habit as he lived," and their anticipation to feel the spell of a unique personality. Yet we learn from the biography that he lacked the personal magnetism and fascination which his poems might have led us to expect. He was too ineffectual a figure, too little of a flesh and blood reality, to exercise a potent charm or to compel admiration. This lack was due largely to the constant *malaise*, the low vitality of wretched health. Yet the poet gains rather than loses by the fuller presentation of his life. If we must forego the magic of a full-blooded personality, there remain the qualities of his shy genius which largely compensate. His very oddities endear him to us, and the virtues of reverence, gentleness and humility, which were dominant in him, are the abiding memories which remain as we close the book. These traits help to correct any adverse impressions, and remind us, when all is said, that the quality of sanctity which was mated with his song was not altogether dissociated from his life.

The fiction of moral degeneracy has been disposed of forever. Apart from his one weakness, which he shared with De Quincey and Mangan, Francis Thompson wore the white flower of a blameless life. The drama of his earthly existence was enacted only in the high courts of the imagination, and his poems reflect only the history of mental experience which had no counterpart in his actual conduct. In no sense, then, can his name be linked with those of the decadent school—Aubrey Beardsley, Ernest Dowson, Richard Middleton, and others still living. His

addiction to the stimulant which eventually became a necessity with him, though it cannot be condoned, was occasioned by a shattered constitution and physical disability. For this the poet paid the inevitable penalty of exclusion from the actuality of life and of those *faillances* of the will which made impossible the active practices of a naturally religious nature. If this indulgence heightened the splendor, it deepened the miseries of his life. It is pathetic to read of his growing isolation amid the unfolding careers of his friends—the lady of “Love in Dian’s Lap,” and the children of “Sister Songs”—whom he had idealized by his imperial imagination, and whom he would fain tether to him by some thread of song. But all in vain; for reality invaded his dream and claimed them from him against his and their will. Yet the world is the gainer by the gifts of a piercing vision and an unbodied imagination which, if it had little foothold on this work-a-day world, ranged alone towards the poles of spiritual experience, and was at home in the white realms of the supernatural.

Turning to the record of his youth we must confess that his early life, before he became known to his biographer, still remains vague and shadowy. This is due doubtless, to the impenetrable reticence of the poet, which underlay all his garburity. He was born, the son of a doctor, in 1859 at Preston, Lancashire; in 1870 he entered Ushaw College, where he remained for seven years, and later studied medicine for eight years at Owens College, Manchester. The likeness presented of his boyhood at Ushaw and at Manchester is not developed, and remains at most only a negative. The delicate, sensitive boy made no marked impression on his school companions, with whom he had nothing in common, and who did not understand him, as one may read between the lines of his essay on Shelley. We note none of that boyish zest in sports and games (his interest in cricket was a mere velleity), nor those animal spirits and physical qualities which give a boy rank among his equals. He suffered from those disabilities which unfitted him for the priesthood to which he aspired, and for the medical profession for which his parents later intended him. His superiors testify to a dreamy temperament, a dilatoriness and physical in-

capacity which sought refuge from reality in the world of books, especially of the English classics, which he absorbed into his being. At Owens College were sown the seeds of the habit which lasted his lifetime. His failure in his medical studies was a foregone conclusion, and Thompson, in despair, drifted to London, beyond the ken of his parents who could do nothing further for him. Here the record of his career becomes vivid and poignant in detail. For more than two years—1885 to 1888—he underwent extreme privation in the pitiless struggle for existence, forced by want and hunger to undertake the most sordid tasks, and often to herd by night with the homeless outcasts of the metropolis on the Thames embankment, unable to afford a shelter from the inclemency of the weather. In his efforts to eke out a livelihood he became by turns colporteur for a bookseller, apprentice to a shoemaker, a bootblack, a vendor of newspapers and matches, and a caller of cabs at the doors of the theaters. The memories of his dereliction are preserved in a well-known passage of "Sister Songs," which relates how he was befriended in his hour of extremity by a street-girl, who passed darkling out of his life, only to tarry forever in literature as:

"A child . . . . a spring-flower; but a flower  
Fallen from the budded coronal of Spring,  
And through the city-streets blown withering"—

while the moving poem "In no Strange Land" shows how the religious vision of the poet could light the darkest depths of human misery:

"But (when so sad thou canst not sadder)  
Cry;—and upon thy so sore loss  
Shall shine the traffic of Jacob's ladder  
Pitched between Heaven and Charing Cross.  
Yea, in the night, my Soul, my daughter,  
Cry,—clinging Heaven by the hems;  
And lo, Christ walking on the water  
Not of Genesareth, but Thames!"

The wretchedness of his lot was cheered by his literary passions which he pursued under these harrowing circumstances. And always he was a haunter of the libraries until his extreme

shabbiness of attire caused his exclusion. At length an article—one of the productions (among them the exquisite “Dream-Tryst”), penned by him in the fervor of composition by the chance light of some book-stall or street-lamp—sent to Wilfrid Meynell, then editor of *Merrie England*, led, after sundry mishaps, to his discovery. Thenceforth the poet was cared for by one whose generosity ranks highest in the annals of literary patronage. After medical treatment and some months’ respite from the roar and fever of London in the friary at Storrington, Thompson was received into the circle of his friends, and allowed, under kindly supervision, the wayward liberty which habit and idiosyncrasy had made indispensable. He was free to devote himself to his interests in literature, was given work as reviewer for the *Athenaeum*, and the *Academy*, and was introduced to contemporary writers, especially to Coventry Patmore, who was to have such influence on his kindred genius. It was under these favoring conditions that his best work was produced, and his life, always so uncertain, protracted until 1907, when he died of consumption.

Of his appearance and manner of life many characteristic glimpses are contributed to his biography by those who knew him. The odd figure, with the frayed brown ulster and “disastrous” hat which he always wore, grew to be a familiar sight on the London streets as he walked abstractedly, with his satchel of books, for review, to and from the offices of the periodicals. The variety of his literary interests, ranging from war to cricket, his seeming omniscience, his helplessness in trifles, his incapacity in money matters, his harmless loquacity, his pietistic tendencies, his inveterate unpunctuality, his indifference to his person and dress, as of one taking no more thought than lilies—all these traits have become in turn matter for amusing comment from observers. His vagaries made him the despair of a succession of honest landladies. A child-like simplicity made him a natural playmate of the children “Sylvia” and “Monica,” whom he companioned and immortalized. One of the most delightful letters in the volume records his eager solicitude for his charges, whom he accompanied on a skating excursion. He had his measure of good spirits too, “a

laugh readier than a girl's"; and, that he was not lacking in humor, his occasional bulletins in doggerel to Everard would testify. Apart from his one besetting weakness, Thompson's character was of a child-like rectitude. The following dedication of his writings, which were all placed at the service of religion, only reflects the ardor and innocence of his life:

"Last and first, O Queen Mary,  
Of thy white Immaculacy,  
If my work may profit aught,  
Fill with lilies every thought!  
I surmise  
What is white will then be wise."

Indeed, his utter gentleness and humility link him with his namesake St. Francis of Assisi, whose poetic nature he loved so much, and a little incident recorded by his biographer of the poet, recalls the Fioretti of the Saint:

"His little tragedy at New-buildings was a wasp-sting. Enmity had started some days before, when a wasp fell into his wine-glass. It got out and was staggering on the table, when I came upon the scene. Francis stood still, watching with fire in his eye. "You drunken brute," he said, with loud severity. But no wasp, drunken or respectable, would he kill, though he could be bitter. The next day he was stung, and Mr. Wilfrid Blunt holds it of faith that for all that summer, after the poet's malediction, no wasps buzzed in Sussex."

Interesting as are the circumstances of his career, they are almost negligible in the interpretation of the genius of one who lived so largely in the world of the imagination. It is not to this sorry chronicle of one so hopelessly impractical in the mechanics of life, but to his own works, that we must turn for an understanding of Thompson. For the broken purposes, frustrated in his life, are fulfilled in his writings. As Lewis Hinds says: "The real Thompson is he of the poems made in secret,—kin to his forbears, the mystical English poets." From all the disabling accidents of mortality his hieratic Muse soared to realms

"Where seven-quiored psalterings meet;  
And all the gods move with calm hand in hand,  
And eyes that know not trouble and the worm."

His poetic temperament had the rich sensuousness of Keats and Rossetti, chastened by a spiritual austerity. His was the religion of beauty, not mere earthly beauty like theirs, but beauty aspirational, "piercing with all its spirings of utterance into the Infinite." Not without pain, and trial, and travail of the spirit had such heights been won. Many of his poems echo the abandonment and alienation from life of this "poor thief of Song," while others, such as "The Dread of Height," and "By Reason of Thy Law," voice the spiritual desolation of the laureate poet of the bays and thorn-crown. He was an "*anima naturaliter Catholica*," to whom the outward shows of things were but the rubrics of the spirit, and whose singing-robe was a vestment. Nothing is so characteristic as his creed of the sacramental character of nature, and his conviction that "not Shelley, not Wordsworth himself, ever drew so close to the heart of Nature as did the Seraph of Assisi, who was so close to the Heart of God." His genius can be paralleled only by those two other Catholic mystics, Crashaw and Coventry Patmore. Of Crashaw he has the lush luxuriance of diction and imagery; like Coventry Patmore he traces the points of analogy between the human and the divine, and voices his view of the ascetic value of suffering in human life.

"Sadness is beauty's savor, and pain is  
The exceeding keen edge of bliss."

His poetry has well been called the return of the nineteenth century to the spirit of Thomas à Kempis. As regards its form and expression, while it must be admitted that Thompson is in part a derivative poet, yet what he borrowed he mostly changed into something rich and strange. He has not always unerring artistry of metre and rhythm, and his diction is at times doubtful, though its strangeness often results from its seventeenth-century manner. But when theme and passion are fused in perfect music, as in the "Hound of Heaven," he is incomparable. In inspiration and vision, he remains one of the great poets of all time, and the supreme Catholic poet in English literature.

FLORENCE MOYNIHAN.



## THE PHILOSOPHY OF HENRI BERGSON.

---

In 1889 a young man—he was then thirty, and at thirty a philosopher is young—was defending his doctorate thesis in philosophy at the Sorbonne. The title of his thesis was “*Les données immédiates de la conscience*,” literally “The Immediate Data of Consciousness,” a work now famous, translated into many languages, and particularly into English under the title “Time and Free Will.” Both the dissertation itself and its defense by the author were original, brilliant, and bristled with sparkling figures and metaphors suggestive of an uninterrupted succession of fireworks. At the close of the discussion, a member of the academic jury, Professor Ravaisson, complimented the candidate, and added: “I have not always been able to grasp your meaning, but, I have no doubt, Sir, you understood yourself.” The new doctor was Henri Bergson, who during the twenty-five years that have since elapsed has occupied successively various important positions as professor in several colleges, Master of Conferences at the Ecole Normale (1898-1900), and since 1900 professor at the Collège de France. In 1901 he was elected to membership in the French Institute in the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, and on the 12th of February 1914, to membership in the French Academy as one of the forty “immortals.” His main philosophical works — besides his doctorate dissertation — are “*Matière et mémoire*” (1896), and “*L'évolution créatrice*” (1907), both translated into English under the titles “Matter and Memory,” and “Creative Evolution.” To these must be added a number of articles, and a work on “Laughter: an Essay on the Meaning of the Comic.”

It is not always an easy matter to follow the author's thought, and he has complained many a time of having been misunderstood. Of a report from professors in French colleges, who had been asked to state what influence Professor Bergson's doctrine had on their teaching, he himself said: “In the

theories which they attribute to me I recognize nothing as coming from me, nothing which I ever thought, taught, or wrote." (*Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie*, January 1908, pp. 20, 21.) Hence when we see that today Professor Bergson is hailed as one of the greatest living philosophers, that the hall in which he lectures is too small to accommodate all those who wish to hear him, that, not only in France but all over the world, his doctrine has many disciples and is a center of philosophical discussion, that his world-wide influence is universally recognized even by his opponents, we are tempted to ask ourselves: Is it because his doctrine is understood, or because it is not understood? And we cannot fail to ask: Is it because it opens up new problems, or because it offers new solutions of old problems? Is it because of the cogency of the proofs by which his views are established, or because of some other reasons extrinsic to these views? These questions, however, cannot be answered until we have outlined the central ideas of Bergson's philosophy.

Now this is no easy task, for there are many more ideas in this philosophy than can be summarized intelligibly in a few pages. Moreover, as it is essentially a philosophy of change, mobility, and flux, we need not be surprised if it is always wavering, flickering, undulating. When we are quite sure that we understand, we find a moment later that we did not. When a spark throws its light into our mind, it is followed almost immediately by complete darkness. When we are lifted on the crest of a wave, we almost immediately sink again into the depression that follows it.

We shall try to express those waves of thought that rise most frequently, to catch the fundamental notes that recur with the greatest regularity in this philosophical melody full of changes in the key, tempo, rhythm, and expression. Generally we shall use the author's own words, and our exposition accordingly will consist mostly of quotations. This is the method followed by all the exponents of Professor Bergson's philosophy, even when they do not use quotation marks. Unless otherwise indicated the quotations are from *Creative Evolution* in the English translation—which, however, does not render the picturesque

ness of Bergson's own style. This work embodies in their latest expression the conclusions of Bergson's other works.

Two ideas seem to give the key to Bergson's philosophy: Duration as the reality of things, and intuition as the means of knowing this reality. Between these must be placed the idea of evolution which explains both the development of reality and the genesis of the faculties of knowledge. These three problems, however, cannot be kept apart; they permeate and essentially depend on one another, and it is only for the sake of clearness that we distinguish them here.

\* \* \*

Professor Bergson's philosophy is essentially a return to the philosophy of Heraclitus. While the school of Elea held that reality is unchangeable, and hence that change is only apparent and illusory, Heraclitus of Ephesus asserted that nothing is permanent, that everything in the world is carried on by the perpetual stream of change, and that consequently things cannot be said to be, but to flow and to become. Now listen to Professor Bergson: "Matter or mind, reality has appeared to us as a perpetual becoming. It makes itself, or it unmakes itself, but it is never something made" (272). "Reality is a perpetual growth, a creation pursued without end" (239). "Things and states are only views, taken by our mind, of becoming. There are no things, there are only actions" (248).

Hence the importance of time or duration which is identical with becoming, and therefore with the reality of things. "Pure duration" has nothing in common with mathematical time which is not real. The scientist constantly tries to think time in terms of space by identifying what he calls time with the straight line by which he graphically represents it. For him time is inert; in reality pure duration is change, activity, creation; it has "real efficacy," and is "a kind of force" (338-345). "The more we study the nature of time, the more we shall comprehend that duration means invention, the creation of forms, the continual elaboration of the absolutely new" (11).

Whence comes this opposition between physical time and real

duration? From the fact that science insists on attributing to time quantity, number, and homogeneity which belongs only to space. Time in itself is essentially non-quantitative. Why? Because quantity and number imply a co-existence of parts and units, for only co-existing things can form a quantitative or numerical aggregate, and co-existence means juxtaposition in space. To think of time as quantitative and divisible is to substitute simultaneity for succession which is the very essence of time. Time is pure quality and pure heterogeneity, a succession of qualitative changes which merge into one another, without precise outlines, without any tendency to be external to one another, hence without any relation to number (*Time and Free Will*, 104).

We may see this more clearly in our own mind, and Bergson protests most emphatically against all forms of quantitative psychology, which consider consciousness as composed of the juxtaposition of distinct states. The mind is constantly changing, and the change is far more radical than we are inclined to suppose at first. For we are at first inclined to think that while sensations, feelings, volitions, ideas, and in general conscious processes of all kind, succeed one another, each remains identical until it is succeeded by another process. The truth, however, is that they are constantly changing, and that "if a mental state ceased to vary, its duration would cease to flow." Even if other influences were not at work, there is at least and in every case the influence of memory which conveys something of the past into the present, so that a mental state, "as it advances on the road of time, is continually swelling with the duration which it accumulates." We notice the change only when it has become considerable, but "the truth is that we change without ceasing, and that the state itself is nothing but change." The transition from one state to the following is also continuous, and the distinction which we make between our various mental states is artificial; in reality there is an uninterrupted flux. Hence "the apparent discontinuity of the psychological life is due to our attention being fixed on it by a series of separate acts: actually there is only a gentle slope, but in following the broken line of our acts of attention we think we

perceive separate steps." Now the mind feels obliged to reunite by an artificial bond these states which it has distinguished artificially. It imagines a substance, "a formless *ego*, indifferent and unchangeable, on which it threads the psychic states which it has set up as independent entities." This substratum has no reality, and the mind is nothing but a perpetual flux. Mental states, conceived as so many solids in space, strung upon an ego or a substance of the soul as a thread, can never make up that duration which flows. Hence "time is just the stuff it [psychical life] is made of. There is no stuff more resistant nor more substantial" (1-4).

What is true of the mind is also true of the whole universe, which, considered in its totality, has "a form of existence like our own" (11), and "matter, looked at as an undivided whole, must be a flux rather than a thing" (186). Briefly, therefore, duration is "the foundation of our being, and . . . the very substance of the world in which we live" (39), "the very life of things, the fundamental reality" (317).

This assertion will be made clearer when we speak of Bergson's theory of evolution. We shall see that real duration is some form of consciousness, a principle which, by the development of its primitive impulse, is the source of everything that exists. But it seems preferable to outline first Bergson's theory of knowledge.

\* \* \*

From the fact that reality is essentially change, becoming, duration, Bergson infers that our intelligence is not capable of knowing it. There is an opposition between intelligence as the instrument of science, and intuition as the instrument of philosophy. The intellect is a faculty orientated primarily toward action, and its function is essentially utilitarian; hence it is interested in stability rather than in motion, in the distinction between objects rather than in real continuity. Hence again a twofold misapprehension of ever changing and continuous reality as permanent and as divided.

In the first place, the objects we act on are certainly mobile objects, but the important thing for us to know is whither the mobile object is going, and where it is at any moment of its

passage. In other words, our interest is directed first of all to its actual or future positions, and not to the progress by which it passes from one position to another. From mobility itself our intellect turns aside because it has nothing to gain in dealing with it. Although movement is reality itself, the intellect always starts from immobility, and tries to form an idea of movement out of immobilities put together (154-155). Our ideas are thus stable views taken of the instability of things, and the mechanism of our ordinary knowledge is of a cinematographical kind. Every picture on the film represents a fixed attitude of the moving object; it is not at all a moving picture, but the movement is in the apparatus whose function is to unroll the film, and, by the rapid succession of pictures, to imitate the movement of the real object. In the same way ideas are, as it were, snapshots representing fixed attitudes, but not the real change, of the passing reality (305-315).

In the second place, the universe is continuous. There is no interruption, no clear-cut division anywhere. The bodies which we perceive are, so to speak, cut out of the stuff of nature by our perception, and the scissors follow in some way the lines along which action might be taken (12). In the immense piece of cloth which is the whole of matter we cut out what we will and sew it together again as we please, and always from the point of view of action. "The intellect is characterized by the unlimited power of decomposing according to any law and of recomposing into any system" (156-157).

In one word, the function of the intellect is "to solidify into discontinuous images the fluid continuity of the real" (302), and philosophers "are mistaken when they import into the domain of speculation a method of thinking which is made for action" (155). What then will be the method of philosophy? How shall we know the "fluid continuity of the real"? By intuition, and in order to understand the meaning of intuition let us begin with that of instinct to which it is closely related.

"We know that the different species of hymenoptera that have the paralyzing instinct lay their eggs in spiders, beetles or caterpillars, which, having first been subjected by the wasp to a skilful surgical operation, will go on living motionless a cer-

tain number of days, and thus provide the larvæ with fresh meat. In the sting which they give to the nerve-centres of their victim, in order to destroy its power of moving, without killing it, these different species of hymenoptera take into account, so to speak, the different species of prey they respectively attack. The *Scolia*, which attacks a larva of the rose-beetle, stings it in one point only, but in this point the motor ganglia are concentrated, and those ganglia alone; the stinging of other ganglia might cause death and putrefaction, which it must avoid. The yellow-winged *Sphex*, which has chosen the cricket for its victim, knows that the cricket has three nerve-centres which serve its three pairs of legs—or at least it acts as if it knew this. It stings the insect first under the neck, then behind the prothorax, and then where the thorax joins the abdomen. The *Ammophila Hirsuta* gives nine successive strokes of its sting upon nine nerve-centres of its caterpillar, and then seizes the head and squeezes it in its mandibles, enough to cause paralysis without death" (172). Such facts—many others might be mentioned—are not explainable by any kind of intelligence, with its general concepts that are crystallized and dead; they are explainable only by instinct, a sympathy by which the concrete manifestations of life are felt from within rather than known from without, lived rather than represented.

The essential difference between intelligence and instinct is the following: "There are things that intelligence alone is able to seek, but which, by itself, it will never find. These things instinct alone could find; but it will never seek them" (151). More specifically this difference may be examined from the point of view of action and from the point of view of knowledge.

From the point of view of action: If we consider only those typical cases in which the complete triumph of intelligence and of instinct is seen, we find this essential difference between them: instinct is a faculty of using and even of constructing organized instruments; intelligence is the faculty of making and using unorganized instruments or tools. The instrument constructed by instinct is the organ itself which is adapted to the satisfaction of immediate needs, but possesses only a very narrow range of action. The tool constructed by intelligence has

a wider range of efficacy, but is less perfectly adapted to the satisfaction of immediate needs (139-141).

From the point of view of knowledge: "Intelligence . . . is the knowledge of a form; instinct implies the knowledge of a matter" (149); that is, instinct has an intimate and full knowledge of its object, a knowledge which is implied in the accomplished action, but which is essentially the knowledge of one special object. Intelligence, on the contrary, possesses an external and empty knowledge of a form, and this form, because it is only a fixed and unchanging representation of change, "a snapshot view of a transition" (302), may be applied to an infinite number of objects.

Intelligence then, because it is adapted to the knowledge of inert matter, is forever unable to find, although always seeking to understand, life, which is continuity, duration, invention, change, creation. Instinct, on the contrary, in its own narrow way, "is molded on the very form of life," and through its action knows life from within; but, because it is incapable of reflection, it is unable to enlarge and extend its object, and hence it will never seek those things which it alone could find (165).

Such instinct is too narrow, too special, too heavily laden with unconsciousness; but if it became disinterested and self-conscious, that is, if it became intuition, it would lead us to the very inwardness of life itself. For intuition means "instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and of enlarging it indefinitely" (176). We find an analogous process in the field of æsthetics. The artist sees not only the assembled features of the object, but the intention of life, the movement that runs through them, binds them together, and gives them significance. To this end he tries to place himself within the object by a kind of sympathy, and to break down the barrier that space puts up between him and his model (177). Æsthetic intuition is narrow and attains only one individual object; philosophical intuition has life in general for its object. Both are a sympathetic union of the mind with its object.

But as empirical sciences, based primarily on facts, need



reason to ascertain these facts and test the value of the conclusions drawn from them, so philosophy, whose chief instrument is intuition, also needs intelligence to verify the facts which lead to the intuitive grasp of reality and to test the value of the intuition itself. It is therefore the union and the co-operation of these two faculties, intuition and intelligence, that will enable us to have a philosophy. "No doubt this philosophy will never obtain a knowledge of its object comparable to that which science has of its own. Intelligence remains the luminous nucleus around which instinct, even enlarged and purified into intuition, forms only a vague nebulosity. But, in default of knowledge properly so-called, reserved to pure intelligence, intuition may enable us to grasp what it is that intelligence fails to give us, and indicate the means of supplementing it. On the one hand it will utilize the mechanism of intelligence itself to show how intellectual molds cease to be strictly applicable; and on the other hand, by its own work, it will suggest to us the vague feeling, if nothing more, of what must take the place of intellectual molds. . . Then, by the sympathetic communication which it establishes between us and the rest of the living, by the expansion of our consciousness which it brings about, it introduces us into life's own domain which is reciprocal interpenetration, endlessly continued creation. But, though it thereby transcends intelligence, it is from intelligence that has come the push that has made it rise to the point it has reached" (177).

\* \* \*

The theory of knowledge, that is, the relation of instinct and intuition to intelligence, is not only a method and a starting-point in Professor Bergson's philosophy; it is also the conclusion to which the theory of life leads. Evolution, on the one hand, explains the genesis of both instinct and intelligence, and, on the other, leads to the essentials of an ultimate conception of reality. Hence the doctrine of evolution includes two points, the theory of life and the metaphysics of reality.

I. *Theory of Life*.—Like consciousness, life is essentially continuity of change, preservation of the past in the present, real duration, uninterrupted creation. Hence the philosophy

of life is inseparable from the philosophy of its evolution. "The essential thing is the continuous progress indefinitely pursued, an invisible progress, on which each visible organism rides during the short interval of time given it to live" (27). Briefly stated, the evolution of life must be understood as the penetration of matter by a broad current of consciousness, endowed with an enormous multiplicity of interwoven virtualities (181).

This primitive current of life underwent division owing to two influences, one external, the resistance of inert matter, the other internal, the nature of life itself. Life is "like a shell which suddenly bursts into fragments, which fragments, being themselves shells, burst in their turn into fragments destined to burst again, and so on" (98). And as the way the shell bursts depends on both the explosive force of the powder it contains and the resistance of the metal surrounding it, so the directions which life takes depend on both the resistance offered to the vital current by inert matter and the explosive force which life bears within itself. Life has overcome the resistance of matter by penetrating and organizing this matter, so that the material organ of the living being represents not so much a sum of means which life employed as a sum of obstacles which it avoided, not so much a positive success of life in furthering its own purpose as a negative success in solving a difficulty and going around an impediment (93). The other cause of division is the very nature of life, "for life is a tendency, and the essence of a tendency is to develop in the form of a sheaf, creating, by its very growth, divergent directions among which its impetus is divided" (99).

The current of life bifurcated first in two general directions, one toward plants, the other toward animals. But it must be remarked that, in any classification of living beings, the group must not be defined by the exclusive possession of certain properties, but by its tendency to emphasize them. Thus "there is not a single property of vegetable life that is not found, in some degree, in certain animals; not a single characteristic feature of the animal that has not been seen in certain species or at cer-

tain moments in the vegetable world" (106). What, then, is the essential difference between these two directions of life? In general life tends to introduce into matter the greatest possible amount of indetermination, both by the accumulation of potential energy and by the utilization of it according to the needs of action. The plant has taken the lazy course, and applies itself chiefly to the accumulation of energy which it appropriates from the inorganic world, and, as this function does not require any change of place, the plant has condemned itself to fixity and immobility. As a consequence it has condemned itself to unconsciousness, or rather, it has allowed its consciousness to fall "asleep," for actual consciousness varies in proportion to free motion. The animal, on the contrary, applies itself chiefly to the utilization of energy which it derives from plants or from other animals. To this end, organs, and especially the nervous system, have been developed, which, by becoming more and more complex, open a wider field to freedom and indetermination. The animal has evolved in the direction of locomotor activity, and consequently of "awakened" consciousness (105 ff.).

Animal life itself took two divergent directions, one toward instinct, reaching its highest development in hymenoptera, the other toward intelligence, leading to man. Instinct and intelligence are not two degrees of the same faculty; they are "opposite and complementary," but not "things of the same order" (135). Yet, because they have the same common origin, neither is ever found in a pure state. "There is no intelligence in which some traces of instinct are not to be discovered, more especially no instinct that is not surrounded with a fringe of intelligence" (136). It is this fact that has misled many to admit between instinct and intelligence no more than a difference of degree. But in reality they are of a different kind, and therefore, in opposition to what many evolutionists assert, man and animal cannot be related by any linear evolution.

II. *Metaphysics of Reality*.—So far we have indicated the lines followed by the main divisions of the vital current. Is it possible to go higher, and to reduce matter, life, and mind with

its two manifestations as instinct and intelligence, to one and the same ultimate reality? Yes; the same fundamental essence is common to them, namely, pure duration or becoming, active and creative, which, for want of a better word, we must call consciousness or better supra-consciousness. Its evolution consists of a twofold movement; one upwards, which is life, action making itself, effort, impulse; the other downwards, which is matter, action unmaking itself, extension, for matter is "a relaxation of the inextensive into the extensive, and, thereby, of liberty into necessity" (218). Thus "physics is simply psychics inverted" (202), and "the vision we have of the material world is that of a weight which falls" (245). The upward current of life, as we have seen, overcomes the obstacle which it encounters in the downward return of matter by the creation of organs in this matter. To make this clearer, Bergson uses the following comparison: "Let us imagine a vessel full of steam at a high pressure, and here and there in its sides a crack through which the steam is escaping in a jet. The steam thrown into the air is nearly all condensed into little drops which fall back, and this condensation and this fall represent simply the loss of something, an interruption, a deficit. But a small part of the jet of steam subsists, uncondensed, for some seconds; it is making an effort to raise the drops which are falling; it succeeds at most in retarding their fall. So, from an immense reservoir of life, jets must be gushing out unceasingly, of which each, falling back, is a world" (247), and new worlds are still being born (241, 248).

We find in ourselves something analogical to this double process. "The more we succeed in making ourselves conscious of our progress in pure duration, the more we feel the different parts of our being enter into each other, and our whole personality concentrate itself in a point, or rather a sharp edge, pressed against the future and cutting into it unceasingly. . . But suppose we let ourselves go, and, instead of acting, dream. At once the self is scattered; our past, which till then was gathered together into the indivisible impulsion it communicated to us, is broken up into a thousand recollections made external to

one another. They give up interpenetrating in the degree that they become fixed. Our personality thus descends in the direction of space" (201) since it acquires the characteristics of space, namely, multiplicity and number.

The genesis of intelligence as compared to intuition is parallel to that of matter as compared to the vital current, "intellectuality and materiality being of the same nature and having been produced in the same way" (219, Cf. 199). The human mind also may take two opposite directions. In intuition it follows the ascending direction of life, and is incessant progress and tension. In intelligence it follows the descending direction of matter, and is a regress, a relaxation of tension leading to extension. Matter tends to extension and space, and it is in geometry, the science of extension and space, that human intelligence finds its connatural achievement and triumph (223, 210).

To sum up, in Bergson's words, this whole process of evolution: "Let us try to see, no longer with the eyes of the intellect alone, which grasps only the already made and which looks from the outside, but with the spirit, I mean with that faculty of seeing which is immanent in the faculty of acting and which springs up, somehow, by the twisting of the will on itself, when action is turned into knowledge, like heat, so to say, into light. To movement, then, everything will be restored, and into movement everything will be resolved. Where the understanding . . . shows us parts infinitely manifold . . . we catch a glimpse of a simple process, an action which is making itself across an action of the same kind which is unmaking itself, like the fiery path torn by the last rocket of a fireworks display through the black cinders of the spent rockets that are falling dead. . . . It is consciousness, or rather supra-consciousness, that is at the origin of life. Consciousness, or supra-consciousness, is the name for the rocket whose extinguished fragments fall back as matter; consciousness, again, is the name for that which subsists of the rocket itself, passing through the fragments and lighting them up into organisms" (250, 261).

The concluding words of *Creative Evolution* express briefly the author's whole philosophical doctrine: "Making a clean

sweep of everything that is only an imaginative symbol, he [the philosopher] will see the material world melt back into a simple flux, a continuity of flowing, a becoming. And he will thus be prepared to discover real duration there where it is still more useful to find it, in the realm of life and of consciousness. For, so far as inert matter is concerned, we may neglect the flowing without committing a serious error: matter is weighted with geometry; and matter, the reality which *descends*, endures only by its connection with that which *ascends*. But life and consciousness are this very ascension. . . . Philosophy is not only the turning of the mind homeward, the coincidence of human consciousness with the living principle whence it emanates, a contact with the creative effort; it is the study of becoming in general, it is true evolutionism" (369).

\* \* \*

In the preceding pages we have endeavored to outline the central ideas of Professor Bergson's philosophy. Evidently many interesting features have been omitted, such as the author's conception and defense of freedom, the functions of the brain, the relations between the mind and the organism, the doctrine of sense-perception and memory, of finalism, etc. Intuition as the chief instrument of philosophy; creative evolution as the genetic explanation of life and matter, of intuition and intellect; pure duration, the vital impulse, supra-consciousness, as the ultimate reality of all that exists; such are the foundations of a philosophy which has found its way throughout the world, and in varying degrees permeates its whole thought. What is the reason of this success which has but few parallel instances in the history of philosophy?

Surely it is not the cogency of the proofs by which this philosophy is established, since, according to Bergson, to prove by logical demonstration is to use the fragmentary and inert concepts, the artificial categories, and immutable principles of the intellect, a faculty which is utterly incapable of giving us an insight of reality. What philosophy leads us to is rather a "sympathy" and a "vague feeling"; it makes us live the reality of things rather than know them intellectually. Hence

it is vague and indistinct because, around the intellect as a nucleus, intuition, the instrument of philosophy, is like "an indistinct fringe that fades off into darkness" (46).

Nor consequently is this success due to clearness of thought, obtained by the use of strict definitions and methodical divisions. This is possible for an intellectual, not for an intuitional, philosophy. "A perfect definition applies only to a *completed* reality; now, vital properties are never entirely realized, though always on the way to become so; they are not so much *states* as *tendencies*" (13). We are accustomed to require strict definitions and divisions because we look upon reality as composed of things rather than as consisting essentially of progress and becoming, because we think in terms of space rather than in terms of time, and because we mistake our motionless snap-shot views for the movement which is reality itself.

Undoubtedly the fame of Professor Bergson is due in some measure to the fact that he is an artist, a poet, who pleases by the brilliancy of his style, his frequent use of well-chosen metaphors, figures and comparisons. Remember, for instance, the cinematograph, which, with distinct and motionless pictures, produces the illusion of movement and continuity; the rockets which represent creative evolution, going up as thought full of life and falling extinct as matter; the steam condensed into little drops each of which falling back is a world; the shell that bursts into fragments, bursting again into other fragments, etc. In philosophy perhaps we should qualify this as an abuse of metaphors, because these may be clear while the doctrine they seek to illustrate is obscure; and as the metaphor appeals to the imagination, it may give the reader the illusion that he understands the philosophy. Moreover, the reader naturally supplies the fireworks maker, the substance of the water which resolves into steam, the maker and operator of the moving pictures, and generally the thing, the cause, the substance, with which he has no difficulty in understanding the metaphor. He is in danger of forgetting that Professor Bergson denies all these, and admits only the movement, the duration, the perpetual flux, change, and becoming. Yet the artistic talent of Bergson cannot fail to

elicit admiration, and men are ever inclined to follow those whom they admire. It is an undeniable fact of ordinary psychology that to please is half the work of producing conviction.

Furthermore, Bergson's philosophy is above all a philosophy of life. Owing chiefly to the advance of practical science, man has grown accustomed to pay much more attention to what things do than to what they are, and Bergson constantly emphasizes the dynamic aspect of reality. A conception of the universe as movement and action naturally appeals to men of today who look upon activity and efficiency as the standard according to which the value of every man and of every thing is to be estimated, and who consequently are quite willing to admit with Bergson that man is not *Homo sapiens*, but *Homo faber* (139), that the most important characteristic of man is not knowledge, but action.

More important than all other explanations of Bergson's popularity, however, is the fact that Bergson is a philosopher, whose earnestness, sincerity, and love of truth cannot be doubted, and whose thought is always powerful and original. No time can be more favorable than the present to the development of a philosophy. For years, in the field of philosophy, the human mind has been starved. It was offered a food which was not sufficient to satisfy it, and was denied that which its very nature craves and demands imperiously. The questions which are of vital moment and to which man constantly seeks an answer had been declared forever unanswerable. For, if we except Catholic philosophy, which was given but scant recognition when it was not entirely ignored, the prevalent philosophical systems—Kantianism, positivism, empiricism, associationism, agnosticism—however different from, and even antagonistic to, one another on other points, agreed in denying the possibility of metaphysics. The human mind, tortured by the desire of knowing, turned on all sides for some light toward those who were recognized as the leaders of thought, and to its inquiries almost invariably received the same reply, so tersely expressed by Du Bois-Reymond: "*Ignoramus et ignorabimus.*" We do not know, and we shall never know. Be satisfied with the knowledge of this mate-



rial universe; whatever is spiritual, ultimate, eternal, the first cause and the last end, is forever inaccessible to human reason. Ask not such questions, they cannot be answered. Bergson boldly reacts against this well-nigh universal tendency, and, after shattering the idols of modern agnosticism, starts to build a philosophy, and to answer questions which other philosophers had labelled unknowable and even unworthy of consideration. It is natural that the world should listen to his words. But as there is danger for the starving man not to distinguish sufficiently between food which is wholesome and that which may be injurious, but to take at once the first thing which is offered to him, so perhaps the world, in its eagerness, is too ready to accept at once without sufficient discrimination the solutions now offered of its most vital problems.

\* \* \*

This would lead us naturally to give an estimate of Bergson's philosophy, but we must limit ourselves to a few general remarks. It must be kept in mind that this philosophy is not yet complete, and that even what Professor Bergson has published must not be taken as absolutely final, for, as he tells us, this philosophy "will only be built up by the collective and progressive effort of many thinkers, of many observers also, completing, correcting, and improving one another" (xiv). So far, Bergson has not gone beyond the theory of knowledge, the philosophy of mind, and cosmology. His views on Theodicy and Ethics are awaited anxiously. To anticipate the author on these points, and to determine beforehand what orientation his doctrine must take, is likely to be misleading, for at times Bergson's thought takes the most sudden and unexpected turns, and all logical implications are in danger of being at fault in a philosophy which is not built with the intellect, and which, like the vital current itself, leads to results that cannot be foreseen.

Bergson's philosophy is certainly a distinct progress on contemporary agnosticism and materialism. The space at our disposal does not allow us to speak of his many noble views, worthy of unreserved praise, of his many valuable criticisms and positive doctrines with which we must heartily agree. But at the

same time it seems clear that the hope, which had been entertained by some Catholic philosophers and apologists, that Bergsonian philosophy might prove to be an auxiliary to the Catholic religion, has to be abandoned.

1. Like Aristotle, Bergson starts from the obvious fact of movement, by which is understood not simply the passage from one place to another, but change in general. Whereas this fact leads Aristotle to the fundamental distinction between, and yet the union of, the reality that changes and the change itself, being and becoming, actuality and potentiality, it leads Bergson to the negation of being, and the assertion that becoming is the reality itself. "In vain shall we seek beneath the change the thing which changes; it is always provisionally, and in order to satisfy our imagination, that we attach the movement to a mobile" (301).

Aristotle seems to hold the only intelligible position. Nothingness cannot become anything, and a change is inconceivable without a reality that changes. For instance, the seed is something, and because it is a seed it has the potency to *become* an organism. Being is the necessary starting-point of becoming. It is also its terminus, for to become means to become something, and where no reality is acquired, or lost, or modified, there is no change. Finally, the stable causes and conditions of development are also something real.

This relation of being to becoming, of stability to change, appears more clearly in ourselves. Under the manifold changes that take place at the surface in consciousness, under the constant succession of mental processes, ideas, emotions, feelings, sensations, etc., we are obliged to place, not a "formless ego, indifferent and unchangeable" (3)—this is a misunderstanding of what we mean by substance—but an ego-substance, and an ego-agent, a being which underlies the becoming and is a source of activity. Under all these changes our own deeper reality, our person, remains identical. Bergson writes: "When we say 'The child becomes a man,' let us take care not to fathom too deeply the literal meaning of the expression, or we shall find that, when we posit the subject 'child,' the attribute 'man' does

not yet apply to it, and that, when we express the attribute 'man,' it applies no more to the subject 'child.' The reality, which is the *transition* from childhood to manhood, has slipped between our fingers. . . . The truth is that if language here were molded on reality we should not say 'The child becomes the man,' but 'There is becoming from the child to the man'. . . . In the second proposition 'becoming' is a subject. It comes to the front. It is the reality itself" (312, 313). This, it seems, is neither a logical analysis of the sentence, nor a true interpretation of the fact. The logical predicate of the proposition is not 'man,' but 'becoming man': 'The child is becoming a man,' i. e., 'This human being, now a child, is developing to manhood.' He is not actually a man, but because he is a young human being, he has the potency of being a man later. And this human being is a substance, a being that changes in regard to size, strength, reasoning power, and all other characteristics that differentiate the man from the child.

2. If progress, change, becoming, cannot be identified with reality, it follows that the intellect, even if it were incapable of knowing progress as such, can through its immobile concepts apprehend the stable aspects of reality. Its abstract representations reveal what is essential and necessary under the individual and contingent representations of the senses. But, in fact, the intellect can know more than this: it does apprehend progress, movement and life, not, however, without a substance, a being, a mobile, but as the passage of the substance from one state to another, from potency to act. Moreover, is not the very ascension of the intellect from the appearance to the real essence, from the imperfect realization to the ideal type, from the contingent to the necessary, from the temporal to the eternal—is not this progress itself the manifestation of a higher life? The concept is not sterile, but its copulation with other ideas gives it unlimited fecundity. It is not the knowledge of "empty" forms, but of fuller reality; not a screen, but a means of communication, between the mind and reality.

And when intuition is offered as a substitute for intelligence, it is under the plea that intelligence is essentially a faculty of action, not of knowledge; a plea which seems to ignore the real

intelligence, and sets in its stead the stunted, abortive, and mutilated intellect of sensism and associationism. Moreover, is not instinct, to which intuition is reduced, more immediately utilitarian than the intellect, and more directly concerned with action? Finally, since intuitions are variable according to individuals, where is the criterion of true and valid intuition, of the one that reaches reality?

Here, as was seen above, Bergson advocates the intimate co-operation of intuition and intelligence, for intuition is "vague and above all discontinuous. It is a lamp almost extinguished, which only glimmers now and then, for a few moments at most" (267). Hence "dialectic is necessary to put intuition to the proof, necessary also in order that intuition should break itself up into concepts, and so be propagated to other men. . . . The philosopher is obliged to abandon intuition, once he has received from it the impetus, and to rely on himself to carry on the movement by pushing the concepts one after another" (238). In one word, intuition needs intelligence "in order not to go astray" (239). Strange control of a faculty which reaches absolute reality by a faculty that gives us only "empty" forms, or rather gives us nothing at all, for "there is no form, since form is immobile, and the reality is movement" (302). A disinterested apprehension of the real, a faculty molded on the very form of life, is now guided and prevented from going astray by a faculty which has for its special function the making of tools, and which is destined exclusively to serve our practical needs. The "lantern glimmering in a tunnel" is called upon to enlighten "the sun which can illuminate the world" (x). Is not this an instance of the blind leading the blind, and even of the blind leading those who see? After estranging so radically these two faculties from each other, it is in vain that an effort is made to bring them together again in mutual co-operation. But, as an argument *ad hominem*, we retain the implied admission that an intellectualistic criticism of Bergson's philosophy is valid, since logic is granted the right to put intuition to the proof.

3. Creative evolution leads us again to the contradiction of a change without anything changing, of a movement without a

moving object, of an evolution without any reality that evolves. It leads us also to monism, at least in the sense of the substantial identity of all that exists in the universe, since we have only manifestations of one and the same supra-consciousness. Matter is but the movement downward and the relaxation of the same current which, as a movement upward and in a state of tension, is life. Souls "are nothing else than the little rills into which the great river of life divides itself" (270). Spirit and matter are therefore substantially identical; they are the same action making itself or unmaking itself. And what is the cause of this process of evolution? We are told that "a Principle of creation has been put at the base of things" (275), but what is this principle with a capital initial? Evidently it is time, pure duration, the vital impulse, consciousness. Is this sufficient, and is it offered as a substitute for God? Bergson, it is true, has given us only a Cosmology, and therefore his explanation of the world is rightly restricted to principles immanent in the world. But it is clear from his anti-intellectualistic principles that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated by reason, since proof supposes the validity of concepts, the immutability of principles, and the fixity of certain truths.

Although Bergson has not yet explicitly stated his views on Theodicy, the following lines on God are found in *Creative Evolution*: "There are no things; there are only actions. . . . Now, if the same kind of action is going on everywhere, whether it is that which is unmaking itself or whether it is that which is striving to remake itself, I simply express this probable similitude when I speak of a centre from which worlds shoot out like rockets in a fire-works display—provided, however, that I do not present this centre as a *thing*, but as a continuity of shooting out. God thus defined has nothing of the already made; He is unceasing life, action, freedom. Creation, so conceived, is not a mystery; we experience it in ourselves when we act freely" (248).

This passage seems to contain the expression of absolute monism, of the substantial identity, not only of all things in the world, but also of God with the world. Yet, Professor Bergson,

in two letters published in *Etudes* (February 20, 1912), explains these words as meaning that God is the "source" from which spring the various currents, every one of which will be a world, and that, therefore, God is "distinct" from these. He speaks of God as a "free creator, generator of both matter and life," and of his doctrine as "a refutation of monism and pantheism in general" (515-517). But we cannot refrain from thinking that the distinction between God and the world is not sharp enough, and that, while Professor Bergson is not a monist like Spinoza, creation as understood by him is certainly not creation as understood by the Church, but some kind of an emanation of all things from the divine reality. Nor can his God, who is unknowable to reason and who has nothing of the already made, but is a centre or a source of shooting out, ever be the Infinite Creator of the universe, distinct from everything else by His very fullness of being and perfection. It is, therefore, in a sense different from that of Saint Paul that Professor Bergson applies to the absolute as conceived by him the words which the Apostle applies to God (Acts xvii, 28). No; it is not of the absolute felt vaguely in intuition, but of God as known by reason, "for the invisible things of Him are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made" (Rom. i, 20); it is not of the absolute conceived as becoming, but of God who gives to Himself the name of "He who is" (Exod. iii, 14) and who "changeth not" (Mal. iii, 6); it is not of the absolute who has nothing of the already made, but of God of whose "greatness there is no end" (Ps. cxliv, 3), that Saint Paul speaks when he utters the sublime words: "In Him we live, and move, and have our being."

C. A. DUBRAY, S. M.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**The Mediaeval Church Architecture of England.** By Charles Herbert Moore. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913. Pp. xxii + 237.

The purpose of this book is to set forth the character of mediaeval church architecture in England in the light of a structural analysis and comparison with the French Gothic art, and of the conditions and influences under which it was produced. It appears to be generally assumed that there was in the Middle Ages a common pointed style, current in all parts of Europe, which, though differing in minor ways in different localities, was essentially the same everywhere. A discriminating study and comparison of the various forms of mediaeval pointed architecture will not justify this view. Such, at least, is Mr. Moore's opinion. "The vigorous spirit of the Northern races was, indeed, widely operative, but under varying circumstances, and with different results according to local conditions. In the Ile de France alone did racial and other conditions conspire to produce an essentially new art, the principles of which were never grasped elsewhere." Things so different as the pointed architecture of the Ile de France, on the one hand, and all other varieties of pointed building, on the other, ought not, Mr. Moore contends, to be called by the same name; for this implies similarity of character and leads to confusion. For the sake of clearness, therefore, he would restrict the use of the term "Gothic" to the French art, using the general term "Pointed" for that architecture of the Middle Ages, whether in England or elsewhere, in which the pointed arch, and other new details, are merely applied to forms of building that retain the structural character of the older art.

But the question of names is of secondary importance. Mr. Moore's object is not only to demonstrate the essential difference of English mediaeval architecture from the French Gothic (notwithstanding that it drew largely and constantly from the French source), but also to do justice to what he considers its finer qualities. While radically different from the French Gothic, and

abounding in structural inconsistencies, the Early English has, he maintains, the quality of beauty to a degree found in few other styles and it had, moreover, possibilities that were never fully worked out. For after 1250 conditions in England, as on the Continent, had changed, and as the finer inspiration declined, architecture became increasingly florid and ostentatious—"a condition that has always marked declining art"—until it sunk into the dry and mechanical formalities of the "Perpendicular Style." Mr. Moore has followed the English art through the various stages of decline, but he has not dwelt on what he regards as its decadence with the same fulness that he has given to its prime. He has not, indeed, treated any part of the subject exhaustively; that would be a task of great magnitude, but he has done enough to set forth the character of English church architecture in the Middle Ages with substantial thoroughness, and enough to emphasize the great and fundamental difference between it and the contemporaneous art of the Ile de France.

Mr. Moore has evidently bestowed great labor on the present volume, which is enhanced with twenty-three plates in half-tone and one hundred and forty-nine illustrations in the text. These latter are, with a few exceptions, from the author's own drawings and from photography, and witness to the care with which he has examined the greater part of the more important mediaeval churches in England. They who have profited by Mr. Moore's earlier works "*Development and Character of Gothic Architecture*" and "*Character of Renaissance Architecture*," will surely desire to have this his latest volume. It is a contribution of the utmost value and importance to the history of the Mediaeval Church architecture of England and its author has laid all students of the subject under a new debt. The make-up of the book reflects the greatest credit on the publishers.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.



**The Mirror of Oxford.** By C. B. Dawson, S. J., M. A. (Exeter College). London: Sands and Co., 1913. Pp. xii + 265.

Ever since religious disabilities have been removed, and all the privileges of Oxford life once again opened to Catholic students, there has been need of just such a book as Father Dawson has here provided. The volume before us opens with a brief review of Oxford's history from the time of its patroness, St. Frideswide, who lived in the first half of the eighth century, to the building of the new church dedicated to SS. Edmund and Frideswide in 1910. This introductory is followed by a chapter on the connection of Oxford with the Religious Orders—a connection recently renewed through the Benedictines, Jesuits and Capuchins. The author next deals with "Oxford's old Churches," amongst which the first place is naturally given to the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, commonly called the University Church. After this the different colleges and halls at Oxford are described individually, in the order of their foundation, beginning with Merton and ending with Keble. There is a closing chapter on "Modern Oxford": it tells of the changes that have taken place since the year 1850 which may be seen to mark an entirely new epoch in the history of the University. The volume is enriched with forty well-chosen illustrations from photographs and with a comprehensive map of Oxford at the Reformation. A full and informing index adds to the completeness of the work which may well serve as a model of its kind. In giving us "The Mirror of Oxford" Father Dawson has not only successfully accomplished his task of "providing Catholic visitors with a story of the University written by a sympathetic hand," but he has done much more, as is indicated by the fact that he has so completely avoided any narrowness of tone in his treatment of the Reformation period. His hand-book is altogether worthy of its subject and of the best traditions. It is full of interest and instruction both for Catholic visitors to Oxford and for those who have to content themselves with reading about the City and University.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

---

**A Divine Friend.** By the Rev. Henry C. Schuyler, S. T. L., with a preface by the Very Rev. Mgr. R. Hugh Benson, M. A. Peter Reilly, Philadelphia, 1913. 8°. Pp. 142.

**Le Courage du Christ.** Par Henry C. Schuyler, S. T. L. Traduit de l'Anglais par F. J. Bonnasseux, Paris, 1913; *La Charité du Christ*—idem; *L'Obéissance du Christ*—idem.

In these works the reader is introduced to a species of literature comparatively unknown. Catholic theology is rich in treatises on the divinity of Christ formally considered, on the Incarnation and its consequences, the part played by the life and death of the Saviour in the great work of salvation, etc.; but relatively little has been written on the Saviour's supremely human characteristics as such, *e. g.*, on His courage and sensibilities, His patience and obedience, His friendships and personal affections as a man. Of course, one need not travel far to find the true solution. The Catholic Church has ever been conscious of and faithful to her primary mission in life, namely, to explain, declare, and defend the divinity of Jesus Christ. In the early centuries the humanity of the Saviour, or at least the perfection of His humanity, was at divers times either questioned or denied, but in every instance the Church proved not unfaithful to her divine commission of not only defending the main truth but also the whole truth. The consequence of this collective defensive action has been her unmistakable definition with regard to Who and What Christ was. Jesus united in Himself, *i. e.*, in His one and undivided Personality, two perfect natures, the human and the divine, so that the historical Christ is declared to have been at once both perfect God and perfect man. For the most part and especially in modern times Catholic apologists have not been called upon to prove that Jesus was man; their task has rather been to prove that He was more than man. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that the character of the literary output has been largely measured by the apologetic demand. The world has been literally flooded with a rich and abundant Catholic literature calculated to defend the divinity of Christ, while relatively little has been written by Catholics on these distinctively human characteristics of Jesus. Never more than now was there need for a Catholic literature neither defensive nor militant, but essentially constructive, presenting Catholicism, not as arrayed in

full armor with levelled lance, but as a thing of beauty, a system of doctrine many-sided and comprehensive. Precisely for this reason our present volume serves a noble and useful purpose. It succeeds in drawing attention to what in reality is a truly Catholic principle, namely, that selective stress and pedagogical distinction are not tantamount to exclusion and that the Catholic Church, while emphasizing the Divinity of Jesus, is not at all unconscious of His supremely real humanity.

The author has already favored the reading public with several volumes on "The Courage of Christ," "The Charity of Christ," and "The Obedience of Christ." A delightful French version of these volumes under the titles "*La Charité du Christ*," "*L'Obéissance du Christ*," and "*Le Courage du Christ*" (translated by F. J. Bonnassieux, published by P. Lethielleux, Paris), has recently appeared, and bears eloquent testimony to the way in which the author's literary efforts have been received across the ocean. The present volume is a contribution to the same series, and it is the reviewer's sincerest hope that it will meet with the same reception as its predecessors, and will be translated, not only into French but also into several other tongues. A work of such exquisite taste and real literary merit can not be too widely published or too generally known.

The critic's attention is attracted at once by the constructive style of the book. The publishers are to be congratulated for producing such a pleasing volume for a very reasonable price; and it is to be hoped that other publishers will use the same ingenuity in placing within popular reach volumes that are moderate in price and artistically constructed. The illustrations, skillfully toned and delicately tinted, are a delight to the eye and worthy of a volume generally sold at four times the actual price of the present volume. Seifert's bust picture of the Divine Friend, which the author has selected for his frontispiece, is very captivating and haunts one long after the volume has been read and laid away.

But it is in the soul of the author discernable in every line of the book that the real charm of the volume consists. The reviewer is conscious of dealing with a personality rather than with a mere written word. The Divine Friendship of which this person speaks impresses one as being an experience he is trying to describe rather than a mere fact of which he has heard and read. It is not meant that the author simply unfolds in his pages a series of unhistorical

or at best subjective speculations. It is quite the contrary. The author takes as the basis of his work the history of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels and popularly interpreted by tradition, and without discussing the various literary problems involved, points out those features and personal gleanings in the life of Jesus which illustrate and typify the truly human affections of the Saviour. In successive chapters he describes the personal attachment that existed between Jesus on one hand and on the other the Baptist, Nicodemus, Judas, St. Peter, Lazarus, Martha, Mary Magdalen and the Beloved Disciple; and in each instance the author's description, as well as his private reflections reveal a personal insight to which scholarship minus friendship would be totally strange. In other words, the friendship of Jesus is described by one who views the Saviour and His relations through the sympathetic eyes of friendship. We take great pleasure, therefore, in recommending, with this volume, the entire series, to all who desire to come into closer personal contact with the Divine Friend.

F. M. O'REILLY.

---

**Advanced American History.** By S. E. Foreman: New York, The Century Co., 1914. Pp. 634.

The title *Advanced American History* must have been intended by the publishers to describe a work more advanced than a grammar school history, for this book is quite elementary and is evidently designed for the use of high schools. It is introduced by a concise account of Europe in the fifteenth century. The first chapter alludes to the presence in China and Tartary of mediæval travellers like Marco Polo. The European travellers in Cathay, in addition to the Polos, were John of Monte Corvino and other Franciscan friars. Because of their contributions to geographical knowledge, to say nothing of their spiritual heroism, they deserve at least a paragraph from posterity.

It is evident that the author has not carefully read the *Journal* kept by Columbus on his first voyage, for economic reasons alone are assigned as the motives for that memorable expedition, whereas it is well known that the primary purpose of Columbus was the extension of Christianity. The economic interpretation of history

may assist in the explanation of many modern achievements. It will not always do so in the ages of faith. An explicit reference should have connected with the exploits of Columbus the expedition commanded by John Cabot.

The physical geography of the United States is concisely described; likewise its climate, plants, and animals. The sketch of the North American Indian is brief but interesting. A short chapter tells of the rise of England, a topic of great intrinsic interest.

The author passes without observation the more recent opinion that John Smith possessed a talent for intrigue and was responsible for not a little of the confusion that reigned in Jamestown. Two maps well illustrate the different interpretations placed upon the Virginia charter of 1609. The coming of claimants, of which there were by the middle of the seventeenth century no fewer than four, is well told. New Netherland was the official name of the Dutch colony, though in Europe there was a reason for writing Netherlands.

The history of the settlement and development of the English colonies is related with much ability and perfect fairness. An instructive section shows the area of settlement and the distribution of population; also the industrial and commercial systems of colonial times. The importance of Irish Presbyterian immigration is set forth with great detail in the pages on the "Scotch-Irish," as the author terms the settlers from Ulster. Religion, government, and education are also noticed.

In his account of the struggle for a continent the author, by an excerpt from Parkman, suggests the zeal and the heroism of the Jesuits in Canada, and the unequal nature of the conflict between the English and the French. In our opinion the exile of the Acadians should have been mentioned as a blot on the English escutcheon. The author appears to have overlooked the literature on this subject. The terrible defeat of the British at Ticonderoga has been allowed to pass unnoticed. The period between the treaty of Paris and the beginnings of the quarrel with England is admirably described and well illustrated.

In discussing the causes of the Revolution the author does not make it clear that the opposition to the Quebec Act was an early manifestation of religious intolerance. High school students should be taught that on this subject the Continental Congress used one set of sentiments in their correspondence with King George III and quite another in their address to the Canadians.

The military phase of the Revolution is not given, as sometimes it is in school books, any undue prominence, but even a hurried sketch should have mentioned the victory of De Grasse over the English fleet at the capes of the Chesapeake; also the friendship of the Spanish authorities at New Orleans, and of the Dutch at Saint Eustatia, in the West Indies. In the section on the extension of geographical knowledge and those on the chapters treating of the establishment of the English colonies the author is not at his best. Yet even in this small part of his book there are very few inaccuracies.

Dr. Foreman writes an entertaining and instructive narrative. His book is concerned with government, with the rise and progress of industries, the movements of population, the struggles of commerce, and the strife of parties. Territorial expansion, the rise and fall of the slave power, the war for Southern independence, the questions growing out of Reconstruction, and the restoration to political power of the natural leaders of society in the South are clearly set forth.

One might take exception to the treatment of Mormonism, in which no mention is made of polygamy. The prophet's quiet teaching on the subject of Cyprian saints, chartered sisters of charity, and spiritual wives led to the secession of many of the early Mormon leaders and to the publication by them of the *Nauvoo Expositor* in which Joseph Smith was denounced. The destruction of its press and other property was one of the justifications and but one, for the visit to the Mormon town of the Carthage Greys and the removal of the prophet to Carthage, where he and his brother, Hyrum Smith, were shot.

The narrative brings the reader as far as the election of President Wilson and in doing so touches a multitude of topics. When one has followed the author from one industrial triumph to another, and from the camp of one political party to that of another, one will conclude that he is chiefly interested in the daily life of the American people. For him social movements are the great attraction. A few limitations have been noticed. In most other works they are far more numerous. In the choice as well as the treatment of themes, Dr. Foreman has been exceedingly happy. In our judgment he places the emphasis precisely where it should be placed and has prepared a remarkably accurate and valuable text-books for high schools.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE

---

**Alumni Meeting.** The Alumni Association of the Catholic University of America, held its Annual Meeting on Wednesday, April 16, at the Savoy Hotel, New York. After the business meeting a banquet was served to over one hundred and fifty members and invited guests. Among the speakers were Cardinal Farley, who responded to the toast, "The Holy Father," Reverend William B. Martin, President of the Association, who responded to the toast "The President," and Monsignor Shahan, who spoke on "The University in Retrospect and Prospect." Hon. W. Bourke Cochran spoke on "The University as a Great Light," and Mr. Patrick Francis Murphy chose as his topic "Time and Chance, the Uncontrollable Twins."

**Public Lecture.** On Thursday, March 26, Doctor Joseph Dunn delivered a lecture in MacMahon Hall on "The Celtic Languages and the People Who Speak Them."

**Minstrel Show.** The members of the Calumet Club are diligently rehearsing a "Show" which is to be put on the local stage and on the stages of several parish halls in Washington. The first date is Monday, April 20, at the Brookland Town Hall.

**Public Lecture.** On Thursday, March 19, Hon. William H. De Lacy lectured in MacMahon Hall on "The Temperance Movement in Europe."

**Doctor Kerby** was recently appointed as a member of a Committee of five to investigate and report to the Attorney General, on the revision and codification of laws affecting children in the District of Columbia. He is also serving on a Committee appointed by the National Civic Federation to study

the efficiency of organized social service in relation to progress. This Committee is to investigate and report also on mutual relations of volunteer and public charities. This work is part of a national survey inaugurated by the National Civic Federation. Twenty-five Committees will undertake to study as many phases of American industrial and social progress during the last generation.

**The New Dining-Hall** is now practically ready for use. The interior decorations, panelling, fixtures and so forth are being completed, and the formal opening will take place in the near future.

**Bust of Cardinal Gibbons.** On Wednesday, April 22, a bust of Cardinal Gibbons was unveiled in the Reception Room of Gibbons Hall. An appropriate address was delivered by Archbishop Moeller.





# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*May, 1914.*

*No. 5.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

**J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XX.*

*May, 1914.*

*No. 5.*

---

## THE SOCIAL JUSTIFICATION OF INTEREST ON CAPITAL.

---

As we saw in a preceding article, interest cannot be conclusively justified on the ground of either productivity or service. There is no sufficient reason for the contention that the capitalist has a strict right to interest because his capital produces interest, or because it renders a service to the laborer or the consumer. On the other hand, we have seen that a part, probably a small part, of the interest now received can be fairly justified on the ground of sacrifice. Certain existing capitalists would not have saved if they had not had the assurance of interest. In their case interest may be regarded as a just compensation for the sacrifice which they underwent when they decided to save instead of consuming.

Nevertheless, they would suffer no injustice if interest were now abolished. Up to the moment of the abolition, they would have been in receipt of their proper compensation; thereafter, they would be in exactly the same position as when they originally chose to save rather than consume. They could sell their capital, and convert the proceeds to their own uses and pleasures, in which case they would obviously have no further claim upon the community for interest. Or, they could retain the ownership of their capital, and postpone its consumption

to some future time. In that event they would regard future as more important than present consumption; they would look upon the superiority of future over present enjoyment as sufficiently great to compensate them for the sacrifice of postponement. They would have no moral claim to interest on the score of abstinence. Hence the sacrifice-justification of interest continues only so long as the interest continues. It extends only to the interest received by certain capitalists in certain circumstances, not to the claims to interest that might be set up by capitalists in general, or capital in general. Hence it presents no moral obstacle to the complete abolition of interest.

Since the greater part of the interest now received cannot be justified on intrinsic grounds, and since that part of it which is thus justified could be abolished consistently with the rights of the recipients, the institution of interest must be vindicated, if at all, on grounds of social welfare. Would its suppression be socially beneficial or socially detrimental?

The interest that we have in mind is, of course, pure interest, not undertaker's profit, nor insurance against risk, nor gross interest. Even if all pure interest were abolished the capitalist who loaned his money would still receive something from the borrower in addition to the repayment of the principal, while the active capitalist would get from the consumer more than the expenses of production. The former would require a premium of, say, one or two per cent. to protect him against the loss of his loaned money. The latter would require the same kind of insurance, and an additional sum to repay him for his labor and enterprise. None of these payments could be abolished in any system of privately directed production. The return that there is question of doing away with is that which the capitalist receives in addition to these payments, and which in this country seems to be somewhere in the neighborhood of three or four per cent.

Another fact to be kept in mind is that in a no-interest regime capital would still have value, and be bought and sold. At present the value of productive capital is, indeed, determined by the revenue or interest that it yields to its own-

ers. If the current rate of interest is five per cent. a factory that brings in ten thousand dollars net return will be valued at about two hundred thousand dollars. Should it suddenly become incapable of producing anything beyond operating expenses (including wages, salaries, insurance, etc.) its value would sink to zero. It would fetch no price in the market because money paid for it would yield no interest. Capitalists would invest their money elsewhere, in interest-producing concerns.

In a no-interest economy, however, such capital, and all other instruments of production that brought in returns sufficient to cover the costs of production, insurance of the capital, and undertaker's profits, would have a market value. Capital-instruments would be in demand as the indispensable receptacles, as the concrete embodiments, of saving and accumulation. For saving cannot in any considerable amount take the form of cash hoards. In the words of Sir Robert Giffen: "The accumulations of a single year, even taking it at one hundred and fifty millions only, . . . would absorb more than the entire metallic currency of the country [Great Britain]. They cannot, therefore, be made in cash." ("Growth of Capital," p. 152). Consequently the instruments of production would be sought and valued by savers for the same reason that safes and safety deposit boxes are required by the owners of precious articles. They would be in demand as the only means of carrying savings over into the future, and the demand would be sufficiently great to cover the cost of producing them. For example, one man might deposit his savings in a bank, whence they would be loaned without interest to a railroad builder, or a factory builder, or some other director of industry. These capital forms would embody and secure and equal the value of the savings. When the owner of the savings desired to recover them he could be paid from the resources of some other depositor, or from the proceeds of the sale of the concrete capital for which they had been expended. Another saver might prefer to invest his money directly in a building, a machine, or a mercantile business, whence he could recover it

later on through a sale of the property. Hence the absence of interest would not change essentially the processes of saving, investment, production, or any of the other activities connected with the use of capital. Capital would still have value, but its valuation would rest on a different basis. Its value would arise not from its power to yield interest, but from its capacity to serve as a receptacle for savings, and to carry over into the future the consuming power of the present.

The question whether the abolition of interest by the States would be socially helpful or socially harmful is mainly, though not entirely, a question of the supply of capital. If the community would not have sufficient capital to provide for all its needs, actual and progressive, the suppression of interest would obviously be a bad policy. Most economists seem inclined to think that this condition would be realized; that, without the inducement of interest, men would neither make new savings nor conserve existing capital in sufficient quantity to supply the wants of society. Very few of them, however, pretend to be able to prove this proposition. So many complex factors, with regard to the possibilities of saving and the motives of savers, enter into the situation that no opinion on the subject can have any stronger basis than probability.

It is sometimes contended that the present rate of interest is necessary in order to induce the existing amount of saving and capital. For, it is assumed, some of those who now save are unwilling to accumulate capital at a lower rate of interest than that now prevailing. Were the rate artificially reduced they would curtail or discontinue their savings to such an extent that the supply of capital would fall below the demand. Owing to this excess of demand over supply, the rate interest would rise, or struggle to rise, to the former level. Hence the present rate is the socially necessary rate. According to this argument, there is an analogy between the rate of interest and the rate of wages of any group. Of ten thousand men who are receiving five dollars a day nine thousand may be willing to work for four dollars, while the other one thousand require five dollars. If the remuneration be reduced to four

dollars the excess of demand over supply will force the rate back to five dollars, and bring the one thousand five-dollar men once more into the market. The same thing will happen when the high-priced section of the savers, "the marginal savers," discontinue their saving activity on account of an artificial lowering of the rate of interest.

Nevertheless the analogy is misleading. The reason why the "marginal" one thousand wage earners refuse to work for four dollars is because they can get employment on better terms in some other occupation. This is a fact which has been established over and over again by observation and experience. On the other hand, there is no experience, no positive evidence, which shows or tends to show that any important number of present savers would discontinue or reduce their accumulations in case they could not obtain the present rate of interest. Their only alternative would be to spend the equivalent of their present savings for present enjoyment. Now we have no empirical data which justify the assumption that any considerable group of savers would choose this alternative rather than accept, say, two or three per cent. interest on their savings.

It is the present demand for capital that is immediately responsible for the existing rate of interest. Even though all savers and capitalists should be willing to continue their functions at a lower rate, no lower rate will be established so long as the volume of demand stands in the present relation to the volume of supply. From the fact—assuming it to be a fact—that savers and capitalists are now getting a higher rate than is required to induce them to maintain the existing supply of capital, it does not necessarily follow that they will increase the supply sufficiently to bring down the rate of interest. Some of them are unable, while others are unwilling, to save the additional amount.

Even though many of the present savers and owners of capital might diminish or discontinue their function as the result of a fall in the rate of interest, the supply of capital would not necessarily be reduced. The places of these "marginal savers" would in all probability be taken by other per-



sons, by those who would be compelled to increase their accumulations in order to provide as amply for the future as they had previously been able to provide with a smaller capital at a higher rate of interest (Cf. Gonner, "Interest and Saving," p. 72; Cassel, "The Nature and Necessity of Interest," ch. iv).

Professor Cassel contends (*loc. cit.*) that there is a certain important class of savers who would diminish very considerably their savings if the rate of interest should fall much below two per cent. They are those persons whose main object in saving is a fund which will some day support them from its interest. At six per cent. a person can accumulate in about twelve years a sum sufficient to provide him with an interest-income equal to the amount annually saved. For example, two thousand dollars saved and put at interest every year will aggregate in twelve years a principal capable of yielding an annual income of two thousand dollars. At two per cent. the same income cannot be obtained through the same amount of saving in less than thirty-five years. At one and one half per cent. forty-seven years will be required. Therefore, concludes Cassel, if the rate falls below two per cent. the average man will decide that life is too short to provide for the future in this way, and will expect to draw upon his principal. This means that he will not need to save as much as when he sought to accumulate a capital large enough to support him out of its interest.

The argument is plausible but not conclusive. If the rate of interest is so low that a man must save for forty-seven years in order to get a sufficient interest-income, he will, of course, be compelled to use up all or part of his capital in his declining years. Nevertheless it does not follow that he will save less than he would if the rate of interest were higher. The determining factor in the situation is the attitude of the saver toward the *capital sum accumulated*. He either desires or does not desire to leave this behind him. In the latter case he will save only as much as is necessary to obtain an annual income composed partly of interest and partly of the principal. If this contemplated income is two thousand dollars, and the

rate of interest is six per cent. he will not need to save that much annually for twelve years. A smaller yearly saving or the same saving for a shorter period will suffice. But if the rate of interest is only one and one half per cent. he will be obliged to save a larger total to secure an equal accumulation and an equal provision for the future.

On the other hand, if the saver does desire to bequeath his capital he will not entirely abandon this intention merely because he is compelled to use some of the capital for the satisfaction of his own wants. If the man who saves two thousand dollars a year for twelve years intends to leave the 33,333 dollars to his children he surely will not decline to save anything for them when he finds that at one and one half per cent. interest he cannot accumulate nearly such a large sum with the same amount of saving during the same number of years. He will not, as Cassel's argument assumes, decide to leave nothing behind him, and merely save the smaller sum which, with the interest thereof, will suffice for his own future. In all probability he will try to provide a sum which, even when diminished by future deductions for his own wants, will approximate as closely as possible the amount that he could have bequeathed had the rate of interest remained at six per cent. In other words, he will be constrained to save more at the low than at the high rate.

The relative insignificance of the sum which would be available for a bequest at a low rate of interest might sometimes, indeed, determine a person to save nothing for this purpose. With the rate at six per cent., a man might be willing to save six hundred dollars a year in order to leave twenty thousand dollars to an educational institution. With the rate at one and one half per cent., the amount that he could hope to accumulate would be so much smaller that it might seem to him not worth while; consequently he would decline to save the six hundred dollars annually. Cases of this kind, however, refer always to the secondary objects of saving, the luxuries rather than the necessities of testamentary transmission. They do not apply to such primary objects as provision for one's

family. When the average man finds that he cannot leave to his wife and children as much as he would desire, as much as he could have bequeathed to them at a higher rate of interest, he will strive to increase rather than decrease or discontinue his efforts to save.

Speaking generally, we may conclude then that the assumption underlying Cassel's contention is contradicted by our experience of human motives and practices. Men who save mainly for a future interest-income, at the same time desiring to keep the principal intact until death, and who could have realized this desire under a high-interest regime, will not become entirely indifferent to the latter aim when they find that they can not attain it completely. They will ordinarily try to leave behind them as large a capital or principal as possible.

The foregoing considerations point even more strongly to the conclusion that this class of persons would tend to increase their savings if interest, instead of being decreased, were utterly abolished. Those who were willing to subordinate present satisfactions to the *primary* future needs of themselves and their families would save at least as much for these ends as they would have saved in a regime of interest. Most of them would probably try to save more in order to make their future provision as nearly as possible equal to what it would have been when interest accrued on their annual savings. Whether a person intended to leave all his accumulations, or part of them, or none of them to posterity, he would still want them to be as large as they might have been under the interest-arrangement. This would mean more saving.

What has just been said refers to saving for primary wants, for those desires and satisfactions which are included in a person's established and cherished standard of living and of bequeathing. Men of average foresight and thrift value this class of future goods more highly than the secondary goods of the present. In other words, future necessities and comforts are generally regarded as more important than present non-essentials and luxuries. Interest or no interest, prudent men will subordinate the latter to the former, and save money ac-

cordingly. However, this occurs only when the two classes of goods differ in importance, when the anticipated satisfactions are more highly estimated than those which might be had to-day. When both future and present goods are of the same order or kind, this rule of preference ceases to operate. In that case the higher valuation is put not upon the future but upon the present. The luxuries of today are more keenly prized than the luxuries of tomorrow. If the latter are to be preferred they must possess some advantage over the luxuries that might be obtained here and now. Such advantage may accrue in various ways: for example, when a man finds that he will have more time for a European trip two years hence than this year, when he prefers a large amount of future enjoyment at one time to present satisfactions taken in small doses, or when a man puts an unusually high estimate upon future as compared with present pleasures. But the most general method of attributing advantage to the secondary satisfactions of the future is to increase their quantity. The majority of foreseeing persons are willing to pass by one hundred dollars worth of enjoyment now for the sake of one hundred and five dollars' worth one year hence. This advantage of quantity is made possible through the receipt of interest. It affects all those persons whose saving, as noted in the last article, involves a sacrifice which can be compensated only through interest, and in general all those persons who are compelled to choose between present and future luxuries. Were interest abolished these classes would cease to save for this kind of future goods.

According to Professor Taussig, "most saving is done by the well-to-do and the rich." ("Principles of Economics," II, 42). If this estimate is correct it seems to indicate that the suppression of interest would reduce the savings and capital of the community very considerably. For the greater part of the savings of the wealthy is derived not from salaries but from interest. Nevertheless, the abolition of interest would be followed by a much wider diffusion of wealth. The sums formerly paid in the form of interest would be distributed in

the form of increased wages and reduced cost of living for large masses of the population. This would mean that the latter would obtain an immensely greater capacity for saving. Out of their increased resources they might save as much as or even more than is now accumulated and invested by the well-to-do and the rich out of interest-incomes. (Cf. Hobson, "The Economics of Distribution," pp. 259-265).

To sum up the results of our inquiry into the subject of the necessity of interest: From the fact that men now receive interest we cannot infer that they would not save without interest. From the fact that many men would certainly save without interest we cannot infer that a sufficient amount would be saved to provide the community with the necessary supply of capital. Whether those classes which would possess the desire and the power to save more would increase their savings sufficiently to counteract the decrease on the part of those other classes whose desire and power would be lessened, is a question that admits of no definite or confident answer. Indeed, it cannot be answered even in terms of probability.

Nevertheless, this uncertainty does not preclude a definite answer to the main question of the social justification of interest. No matter what response be given to the former inquiry, the latter must be answered favorably and affirmatively. If the abolition of interest were followed by a considerable decline in saving and in the supply of capital, the community would be worse off than it is under the regime of interest. To diminish greatly the means of production, and consequently the supply of goods for the community's consumption, would cause far more hardship than it would relieve. While "workless" incomes would be suppressed, and the differences between the revenues of the various classes reduced, the total amount available for distribution would probably be so greatly diminished as to leave every class worse off than before. On the other hand, if we assume that interest could be suppressed without considering any reduction, or any material reduction, in the community's supply of capital, we are still constrained to think that any attempt at suppression would be contrary to the wel-

fare of society. Following are the considerations which compel this conclusion:

The civil authorities could not determine with any degree of precision what part of the gross returns of a business was pure interest, and what part was a necessary compensation for risk, enterprise, and the labor of management. Any attempt to distinguish between them would result in a mixture of futility and social injury. If the State should strive to meet the situation by allowing the directors of industry varying salaries to correspond with their various degrees of efficiency, and different rates of insurance—payments according to the different risks of the concerns, it would inevitably make some allowances so low as to discourage labor and enterprise, and others so high that the recipients would obtain a considerable amount of pure interest in the guise of profits and salaries. Should it fix a flat rate of salaries and profits the more efficient undertakers would refuse to put forth their best efforts, and the more perilous enterprises would be abandoned. Whichever plan were adopted, the practical difficulties would be insuperable. The supervision of expenses, receipts and other details of business in order to prevent evasion of the law, would cost probably more than the total amount now paid in the form of interest. When we add to all these difficulties the hardship to industry resulting from such a system of interference, we cannot but conclude that the attempt legally to abolish interest on producing capital would be socially unwise.

Such abolition might conceivably be effected through the suppression of interest on loans. Competition between interest-free loan capital and capital employed in production by its owners, would probably reduce the interest obtainable on the latter to insignificant proportions. However, this method of prohibition would prove only a little less futile than the other. Even in the Middle Ages, when the amount of money available for loans was comparatively small, and when the civil prohibition was powerfully re-inforced by the canons of the Church and by public opinion, the effort to suppress interest on loans was far from completely successful. Now that the supply of

money and the demand for loans in production have enormously increased, and interest is not definitely disapproved by either public opinion or the Church, a similar policy would probably be on the whole a failure.

Even if interest could, by any method whatever, be abolished, the results would be socially disastrous unless the prohibition were international in its scope. If it were enforced in only one or a few capitalistic countries these would suffer far more through the flight of capital than they would gain through the abolition of interest.

In view of the various and manifold uncertainties and difficulties of the situation, there is not a shadow of doubt that modern States are justified in permitting the institution of interest. The latter is clearly justified on grounds of social utility.

Nevertheless, this fact does not directly and necessarily justify the individual capitalist. It does not of itself prove that the capitalist has a moral right to take interest. Either through lack of prohibitions or failure adequately to enforce them, the civil law permits many actions which are morally wrong in the individual; for example, the payment of starvation wages, the extortion of unjust prices, and prostitution. Legal toleration does not *per se* nor always exonerate the individual offender. How, then, shall the individual interest-receiver be justified?

As already pointed out more than once, those persons who would not save without interest are justified on the ground of sacrifice. So long as the community desires these savings and is willing to pay interest on them, the savers may take it as the fair equivalent of the inconveniences that they undergo in performing this social service.

Those who do not need the inducement of interest, whose sacrifices of saving and conserving their capital are sufficiently compensated without interest, must be justified on indirect grounds and arguments of presumption. In the first place, it is clear that the civil law can make certain practices morally legitimate, and sometimes create moral rights and obligations. For example, the legal requirement that the individual must

repair property losses that he has caused his neighbor unintentionally, is binding *in conscience* as soon as the matter has been adjudicated by the court. In other words, this civil regulation confers on the injured man property rights, and on the inculpable injurer property obligations. Again, the legal provisions concerning prescription give moral validity to this title. When the alien possessor has complied with these provisions, he has a right to the property in question, even though the original owner may later on turn up and claim the property. Several other situations might be cited in which the State admittedly creates, or at least, occasions moral rights of individual ownership which would have no definite existence in the absence of such legal action and authorization.

This principle received its most pertinent application for our purpose in the doctrine of *praemium legale* as a title of interest on loans. In the "Opus Morale" of Ballerini-Palmieri will be found a long list of moral theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who maintained that the mere legal authorization of a certain rate of interest justified the lender in exacting such interest. (Vol. 3, pp. 617-629; 2d Ed.). While they held to the traditional teaching that interest was not justifiable on intrinsic grounds, they maintained that for the sake of the public good the State could rightfully use its power of eminent domain to transfer from the borrower to the lender the money paid as interest on a loan. Of course, they did not mean that the State could arbitrarily take one man's property and hand it over to another. Their contention was that when the civil law sanctioned interest for reasons of public welfare, this extrinsic circumstance annulled the right of the borrower to retain the interest-payment, and transferred it to the lender. In other words, they held that the money paid in loan interest did not belong to either borrower or lender with certainty and definiteness, but that its ownership depended upon the presence or absence of extrinsic circumstances. The extrinsic circumstance of legal authorization for the common good determined that it should belong to the lender. More than one of these writers declared that the State had the same right to determine



this indeterminate property, to assign the title of ownership to the lender, as it had to assign and transfer ownership by the device of prescription. And their general contention seems to have been confirmed by the response of the Congregation of the Poenitentiaria, given February 11, 1832, (*Op. cit.*, p. 627; cf. Van Roey, pp. 73-75) to the Bishop of Verona. The latter had inquired whether a confessor could be absolved who taught that the legal rate of interest could be taken on loans when no other title to interest was present. The answer was in the affirmative.

May not the same moral effect be attributed to the State's sanction of interest on producing capital? That part of the product of industry which is now appropriated as interest could be regarded as a sort of no man's property which the State has a right, for social reasons, to confer upon the capitalist, just as it assigns the "unearned increment," or increases in land values, to the landlord. Through the State's exercise of the power of eminent domain over this part of the product, the proprietor of a grocery business, the stockholder in a railroad, and every other producing capitalist, would obtain a moral right to interest on his capital.

Objection may, however, be taken to the parallel instituted in the last two paragraphs. The public good which is assumed to be involved in the transfer of interest-rights to the present-day capitalist who would continue to function as capitalist without interest, does not at all compare with the public benefit which in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries resulted from the policy of allowing interest on loans. The advocates of the doctrine sketched in the second last paragraph could point to the needs of rising national and international commerce and industry as sufficient reason for awarding interest to men who otherwise would have dissipated or hoarded their money, instead of lending it to the active directors of business. In other words, the public welfare in those days required not merely that the civil law should sanction interest on loans, but that it should confer upon the lender a moral right to interest. Conscientious men needed the assurance that they possessed such a right, in

order that they might have no hesitation in lending their money. Today the public good only requires that the State should refrain from attempting to suppress interest, not that capital owners should feel that they have a right to receive interest. For we are considering only those persons who would save and conserve their capital even if interest were abolished. The fact that many of them would try to get interest in spite of a legal prohibition is sufficient reason for civil toleration of the practice, but not sufficient reason for endowing them with a moral right to take advantage of the practice.

The objection has considerable force. Perhaps the most satisfactory way of dealing with it here is to recall the fact that we have nowhere contended that the intrinsic justification, or attempted justification, of interest on capital is *certainly* invalid. We have merely maintained that the usual intrinsic arguments brought forward on behalf of the capitalist's right to interest are not conclusive. Possibly these arguments have more value than their average proponent has yet shown, and possibly there are other and stronger arguments for the proposition. These possibilities combined with the civil sanction of interest, are sufficient to create a presumption that even those savers and capitalists who would continue as such without interest, are guilty of no injustice when they take interest. Until this presumption is overthrown by facts and arguments it will be adequate to exonerate and justify the individual capitalist. In one word, the interest-receiver must be accorded at least that measure of justification, that moral advantage, which in every doubtful situation accrues to the man who is in possession.

JOHN A. RYAN.

## LABOUR EXCHANGES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

---

For the last three decades of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth distress, due to want of employment and to under-employment, was prevalent in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. One result accruing from so deplorable a condition of affairs was the growing burden on the community at large of the local taxation necessary to provide under the Poor Law for the upkeep of men, women, and children who had become pauperized and thrown on the rates. This upkeep was either entire in the case of those who were inmates of workhouses,<sup>1</sup> or partial when it took the form of "outdoor relief," or doles of money, food, or clothing given to people in their homes. Another result was a noticeable physical deterioration of the race, shown, for example, in the difficulty experienced in finding men to come up to the moderate standard set for service in the army; shown, too, in the prevalence throughout the proletariat in many distressing forms of the countless ills which flesh is heir to.

Bad as these two results undoubtedly were, there was a third, which was perhaps worse than both combined. Concurrently with pauperism and physical deterioration there grew up a loosening of moral fibre, a listlessness, a shiftlessness, a want of thrift, and a mental degeneracy caused by a hopeless outlook on life, and terminating in the reduction of more and more people to the condition of being not only unemployed but even unemployable, and therefore showing a greater tendency and even a willingness to be dependent and to look to the Poor Law or to charity for the support of individuals and families.

At the same time trade, commerce, and industry, although of course subject to cyclical, seasonal, local, and extraordinary periods of depression, flourished as a whole. The annual in-

<sup>1</sup> Or poorhouses: the terms are practically interchangeable in the United Kingdom.

come of the United Kingdom was estimated to have increased from £814,000,000 in 1867 to £1,200,000,000 in 1875, to £1,350,000,000 in 1885, to £1,600,000,000 in 1891, and to £2,000,000,000 in 1903. Great wealth was amassed by individuals. Wages rose steadily in nearly every industrial group between 1886 and 1907. Capable and willing workers, skilled or unskilled, who were successful in finding employment, could usually hold it for the greater part of the year, while times were good; but, when times were bad, they were liable to be thrown idle in great numbers, and so still further swelled the already swollen ranks of the unemployed. Workers even of a high grade, who did not belong to a strong Trade Union capable of paying unemployment benefit for a protracted period, had thus but poor prospects. It was always difficult and often impossible for them during their periods of employment to make provision for their periods of enforced idleness. To make provision for compulsory retirement from work through invalidity or old age was scarcely to be thought of. When either of those dread alternatives occurred, these workers, in the absence of support from their children or connections, which from the very nature of the case was rarely forthcoming, had no prospect but the workhouse, or outdoor relief, or some form of charity from strangers. The case of inefficient workpeople and of the great class known as casual labourers was worse still.

It is clear therefore that a critical social condition had gradually arisen. It was a condition in which a *laissez faire* policy was of no avail. The old-time doctrine of the "economic man" had been blown to atoms. In its place there had been substituted for the last forty, and especially for the last twenty, years a well meant but wrongly conceived series of attempts at betterment of the workers' condition. It was found, however, by disastrous experience that palliatives, like the opening of labour yards in times of exceptional distress for the employment of men in stone-breaking, oakum-picking, or wood-chopping, resulting, in a recorded case, in the outlay of £7 to produce a ton of broken stones value for 12s.; like Municipal Relief Works, which in time came to be almost an annual in-

stitution; like special Charitable Funds, such as the Mansion House Funds of 1867, 1886, 1892-1895, and 1903-1904, the Press Funds of 1903-1904 and other years, the London Unemployed Fund of 1904-1905, and the Queen's Unemployed Fund of 1905-1906, some of which were described as "orgies of relief"; or like the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, with its Distress Committees and its limited number of Labour Bureaus or Exchanges, were entirely unequal to the situation. Of the last mentioned Act one of the deepest students of sociology and one of the acutest thinkers of our day has said:

"Its main service has been to demonstrate beyond question its own essential inadequacy and the inadequacy of all measures which, like itself, leave industrial disorganisation untouched and deal only with the resultant human suffering."<sup>2</sup>

This opinion may be taken as fairly typical of the most advanced modern thought in the United Kingdom. Sociological experiments and legislation meant to be remedial had been going in the wrong direction. Further active intervention on the part of the state, but along totally different lines, seemed to be imperatively called for.

In order to justify such further state interference it was necessary to find out with as much exactitude as possible the true state of affairs, to locate the causes of unemployment and of under-employment, and then to suggest a remedy which might wholly or in great part cure the social ills from which the nation was suffering.

For this end the time-honoured method of inquiry by commission was adopted. This was, and indeed still is, a convenient way of shelving indefinitely some troublesome subject; but the urgency of the present case precluded the possibility of any such result. Accordingly, on December 4, 1905, King Edward VII. by Royal Warrant constituted fifteen men and three women into a commission to inquire

(1). Into the working of the laws relating to the relief of poor persons in the United Kingdom;

(2). Into the various means which have been adopted out-

<sup>2</sup> W. H. Beveridge, *Unemployment, a Problem of Industry*, p. 191.

side of the Poor Laws for meeting distress arising from want of employment, particularly during periods of severe industrial depression.

These Commissioners were authorized to summon witnesses, to call for information in writing, to have access to and to examine all books, documents, registers, and records that could give them the fullest information, to visit and personally inspect such places as they might deem expedient, and to carry on their investigations by all other lawful ways and means. They were enjoined to report, with as little delay as possible, the result of their inquiries, to express their opinion on the matters submitted for their consideration, and in particular to say whether any, and, if so, what, modification of the Poor Laws or changes in their administration or fresh legislation for dealing with distress were in their judgment advisable.

The Commission sat for over three years, and conducted a most thorough and painstaking investigation, covering a very wide economic and sociological range. In fact, the work they performed might properly be described as one of the biggest undertakings of its kind of modern times. When they came to report, however, sharp divisions of opinion were revealed, and accordingly two separate reports—the Majority Report and the Minority Report—were sent in. The Majority Report, signed by fourteen of the Commissioners, is contained in two closely printed large octavo volumes, the first of 565 and the second of 343 pages, and the Minority Report, signed by the other four Commissioners, is contained in one similar volume of 716 pages.

While these two sections of the Commission were hopelessly and irreconcilably at variance on many, if not most, of the important subjects with which they were called upon to deal, they were of one mind in recommending the adoption of a national system of Labour Exchanges as the first step towards the relief of distress due to want of employment.

The Majority Report, Vol. II, p. 231, says:—

“In the forefront of our proposals we place labour exchanges”;  
and again, Vol. II, p. 265:—

“A national system of Labour Exchanges should be established and worked by the Board of Trade for the general purposes of assisting the mobility of labour and of collecting accurate information as to unemployment.”

The Minority Report, p. 637, is equally emphatic:—

“The first requisite is the organisation throughout the whole of the United Kingdom of a complete system of public Labour Exchanges on a national basis. This National Labour Exchange, though in itself no adequate remedy, is the foundation of all our proposals. It is, in our view, an indispensable condition of any real reform.”

These reports were presented on February 4, 1909, and the Government with considerable promptitude proceeded to give effect to the recommendations as to Labour Exchanges on which both reports were in substantial agreement. Already in advance of the actual date borne by the reports their recommendations were known to the Board of Trade, and on January 21, 1909, a Departmental Committee was set to work to consider and report on the organisation and finance of a system of Labour Exchanges. This Committee sent in its report on March 27, 1909, and following the lines laid down therein a Bill “to provide for the establishment of Labour Exchanges and for other purposes incidental thereto” was introduced into Parliament by the then President of the Board of Trade on behalf of the Government on May 20, 1909. Accompanied by an outline of the system proposed to be followed by the Board of Trade and by an estimate of the cost, the Bill was received favorably by leading members of all political parties, and, meeting with little or no opposition, it became law on September 20, as the Labour Exchanges Act, 1909, [9 Edw. VII, Ch. 7.]

This Act is the foundation of that system of Labour Exchanges in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with the working of which this present paper is directly concerned.

A reference to the Act will show that it is limited to a very few clauses, and that it is mainly permissive in character:

“The Board of Trade may establish and maintain, in such places

as they think fit, labour exchanges, and may assist any labour exchanges maintained by any other authorities or persons, and in the exercise of those powers may, if they think fit, co-operate with any other authorities or persons having powers for the purpose.

"The Board of Trade may also, by such other means as they think fit, collect and furnish information as to employers requiring workpeople and workpeople seeking engagement or employment.

"The Board of Trade may appoint such officers and servants for the purposes of this Act as the Board may, with the sanction of the Treasury, determine, and there shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament to such officers and servants such salaries or remuneration as the Treasury may determine, and any expenses incurred by the Board of Trade in carrying this Act into effect, including the payment of travelling and other allowances to members of advisory committees and other expenses in connexion therewith, to such amount as may be sanctioned by the Treasury, shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by Parliament."

That is to say, in plain English, power is given to the Board of Trade to expend money from the national exchequer on the establishment and upkeep of Labour Exchanges.

The Board of Trade was not slow to take advantage of this parliamentary authorization. There was an enormous amount of preliminary details to be seen to, such as the carrying on of needed propaganda work, the drafting of regulations, the preparation of forms, the securing of premises and fitting them up into suitable offices, and the selection of a staff of competent officers.

In connection with the first and second items there was prepared a "Labour Exchanges General Memorandum" of 22 folio pages of print, and also a paper of "General Regulations." The latter was drawn up after consultation with representative associations of employers and workmen. The former is a "Confidential" document, and therefore, although a copy of it was furnished to me, I am debarred from alluding more particularly to it; nor, indeed, is it important that I should do so.

The question of forms was so important that a Departmental Committee was appointed on October 30, 1909, to deal with it. This committee went thoroughly into the matter, having before



it the Act itself, all the official Labour Exchange literature of the Board of Trade, various Confidential Reports, and the forms in use in many German Labour Exchanges, in the Metropolitan Employment Exchanges, and in the Labour Exchanges existing in certain provincial towns in Great Britain. In December, 1909, the Committee made its report, which, covering 31 folio pages, is a model of accuracy, fullness, and foresight.

The questions of premises and of staff were similarly dealt with, that is, by the appointment of special committees to investigate and report. In connection with the recruiting of the staff this is the proper place to note that the usual practice in the United Kingdom, of having officials appointed as the result of a Civil Service examination, was in this case departed from, because of the unprecedented character of the work to be done, and of the necessity for securing the best available ability at the outset of a new enterprise, which was in essence of a highly experimental character. All appointments therefore were made from headquarters and ratified by the Board of Trade. From some considerable experience of all ranks of Labour Exchange officials I am in a position to state that, generally speaking, they appear to have been extremely well chosen in view of the duties to be performed.

The preliminaries being as far as possible arranged, the Labour Exchanges were opened for work on February 1, 1910. By the end of that month there were 83 Labour Exchanges in operation and they have since been gradually increased. The total number originally projected was 254, to be worked from the eleven Divisional Centres of London, Bristol, Nottingham, Birmingham, Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Sheffield, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Glasgow, and Dublin; but because of the necessity of taking in smaller towns and rural districts, and because the exchanges had also to be used in connection with the later-devised scheme of insurance against unemployment, that limit had to be considerably passed. During 1910, 146 exchanges were established; during 1911, 115; during

1912, 153; and during 1913, 11, bringing the total up to 425. By August 15, 1913, the number had still further gone up to 427, but by February 13, 1914, it had fallen to 423.

The Central Office, which is a branch of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, is situated in London. It does not deal directly with either employers or workpeople, except in certain cases of emigration, but serves simply for organization, control, and statistics.

Under this Central Office the whole country is mapped out into eleven divisions, having their centres as above, each under the charge of a Divisional Officer, who has complete authority over, and full responsibility for, all the Exchanges in his Division, and through whom all orders and communications concerning them pass. Each division is a unit both for purposes of control and for the purposes of what has been called "clearing house" work, that is, the transference of work people who are unemployed in one place to meet an unsatisfied demand for labour in another.

In each division there are Exchanges of different grades according to the number, population, and importance of the cities and towns to be served. There are, so far, five grades of Exchanges, viz:—

1. Class A. Exchanges: For Towns over 100,000 population.
2. Class B. Exchanges: For Towns 50,000 to 100,000 population.
3. Class C. Exchanges: For Towns 25,000 to 50,000 population.
4. Sub-Offices: For suburban districts and small towns near larger ones.
5. Waiting Rooms: For special trades and districts, *e. g.*, near docks, etc.

The grade of the Exchange regulates approximately both the staff allowed and the extent and variety of the accommodation for workpeople. In an Exchange of Class A., for instance, the normal staff consists of a manager, four registration clerks,

and a clerk messenger, while a sub-office has only an assistant manager (who works under the supervision of the manager of a neighbouring important exchange), a clerk, and a messenger, and a waiting room has only a single officer. In the larger Exchanges provision is made for dealing separately with skilled workmen, general labourers, skilled women, unskilled women, boys, and girls, whereas in the smallest exchanges there are at most but two separate departments, for men and women, respectively.

The Exchanges are housed for the present in temporary premises such as could be readily found available and adapted to the purpose at short notice. It is intended later to build permanent premises for at least the Class A. Exchanges. A personal inspection of a very large proportion of the Exchanges enables me to say that the adaptation has, as a rule, been well carried out, with due attention to ventilation, lighting, heating, and sanitary conveniences. A special feature is an adequate installation of telephones both for local service and long distance calls.

To illustrate the methods of operation used by the Exchanges, I cannot do better than quote from a paper on the subject read to the *Conférence Internationale du Chômage* at Paris in September, 1910, by the Director of the Labour Exchanges. He says:

“Workpeople are as a rule registered by a clerk who takes down their answers to questions put in accordance with a prescribed form of application, but they may if they prefer it (as is sometimes the case with the more skilled men and clerks) fill in a form themselves and hand it to the clerk. In the former case the answers are entered directly on to an index card which then forms the workman's record in the Exchange; in the latter case the answers filled in by the workman have subsequently to be transferred to an index card. Workpeople are not under any obligation to answer all the questions on the form, and on the other hand they may volunteer additional information. Workpeople residing within three miles of an Exchange are required to register in person; others may make application by post. Applicants under 17 years of

age have a different form, the forms for men, women, boys, and girls all having distinctive colours. On registration each applicant is given a Registration Card. This card he must, so long as he wishes to remain on the register, bring with him every week to the Exchange to be stamped, while if he obtains work through his own efforts he is required to return the card at once to the Exchange through the post with a statement to this effect. When the Registration Card is given out it is marked with the day of the week, and the workman is asked to come again on that same day each following week. The card is addressed on the back to the Labour Exchange and is franked for free transmission through the post. Applications for workpeople are as a rule received by telephone, though naturally in some cases employers write or send a messenger or come themselves. When an application has been received from an employer and a suitable workman found by the Exchange—either from among those in the waiting room or by summoning one from his home—the workman is sent to the employer with an Identification Card, which the latter is requested to sign and return with a statement as to whether the man has been engaged or not. This card also is now franked for free transmission through the post.

The index cards of the workpeople who have registered or renewed their registration within the past week and have not since then obtained employment form the "Live Register" of the Exchange and it is to these primarily that the Exchange looks for the filling of any vacancies that may be notified by employers, these cards being arranged by occupations. It is, moreover, this Live Register that is used for the purpose of statistics. The Cards of those who fail to renew their applications on the right day are generally left for a week or a fortnight in an "Intermediate Register," while there is a "Dead Register" of all those who have obtained employment or have not presented themselves at the Exchange for some weeks. Should one of these men on the Dead Register appear at the Exchange later, his old index card will be used again, but he will count as a fresh registration."

To these details it may be added that the telegraph system, in addition to the other methods specified above, is sometimes used by employers seeking workpeople in a hurry; that where possible there are separate entrances to the Exchange for employers, for workmen, for work women, for boys, and for girls; and that in the larger exchanges there are women clerks to deal with women applicants for employment, with girls, and, often, with boys.

The main characteristics of this Labour Exchange system are summed up by saying that it is national, industrial, free, voluntary, and impartial.

It is national, first, because it covers the whole of the United Kingdom and each Exchange co-operates with every other Exchange to supply workpeople to employers who require them and to find work for workpeople who seek it; and, secondly, because it is administered by a department of the central government through officers appointed and paid by that department.

It is industrial as distinct from eleemosynary. It was made clear to all and sundry from the outset that the Labour Exchanges were in no way associated either with the administration of the Poor Law, or with any form of charity. It was meant to be, and is administered as, a part of the industrial organization of the country. No stigma attaches to the use of it either by employer or employee any more than there does to the use of the post office, the high road, or any other public utility. The questions asked of workpeople have reference to nothing but their qualifications for the employment sought: no question as to their means, the number of their family, their personal habits, their thrift, or anything similar, is ever asked. The Labour Exchange is not for the person who wants relief but is unable or unwilling to work. Employment and information are the only commodities it deals in, and it deals in all kinds of employment, skilled and unskilled, with the one exception of indoor domestic servants.

It is free, because no fees of any kind are asked or expected either from employers or from applicants for employment.

It is voluntary, because no compulsion is or can be exercised upon either employers or applicants for employment to use the Labour Exchanges against their will. The success or failure of the system depends solely on its efficiency or want of efficiency. That of course is not to say that its officials are prevented from taking every legitimate means to prove alike to employers and to those needing employment that it will be to their best interest to use the Labour Exchanges. As a matter of fact, the officials are energetic canvassers among both classes of their patrons, and I think that much of the success that has hitherto attended the working of the Exchanges is due to the forcible reasoning to that effect used on public platforms and in personal interviews by the higher officials.

It is meant to be, and I think may safely be said to be, strictly impartial as between employers and workpeople. Any rare instances of prejudice against, or partiality towards, either side on the part of any official has been visited with condign punishment, either dismissal or reduction of grade. In a system dependent upon the voluntary support of employers and workpeople it would be suicidal to be otherwise than impartial between both when their interests are in real or apparent conflict. In different parts of Germany four principles have been followed by Labour Exchanges in reference to trade disputes:

1. To ignore such disputes altogether, that is, to send workmen to a vacancy created by a dispute in exactly the same way as to any other vacancy and without special warning;
2. To register vacancies created by a dispute and to notify them to applicants for work by giving formal notice of the dispute to each applicant for employment individually or by placards posted in the Exchange premises, thus placing the decision as to seeking or not seeking the vacancy on the applicant;
3. To suspend operations within the range of the dispute during its continuance;
4. To make action in each particular case depend upon the decision of an Arbitration Court.

The second of these methods is the one most favored in Germany, and it also is the one that has been adopted in the Labour

**Exchanges of the United Kingdom.** In accordance with Clause III of the General Regulations any association of employers or workmen may file at a Labour Exchange a statement with regard to the existence of a strike or a lock-out affecting their trade in the district. Such statement shall be in a specified form, and shall be signed by a duly authorized person. This statement must be made known to any applicant for employment to whom there is notified a vacancy with an employer affected by the dispute. Otherwise, the statement is treated as confidential; it is not shown to workmen generally: in fact, it is not shown at all unless and until a vacancy is notified by the employer affected. Further, if an employer affected by the statement notifies to a Labour Exchange a vacancy, he must be told of the statement and given an opportunity of making a written counter-statement, and this counter-statement must be shown along with the original statement to the applicant for work. On the applicant is thrown the onus of deciding what action he will take. So far as the Labour Exchange is concerned, he is a perfectly free agent to accept or decline the employment. Another safeguard is that the original statement is valid for seven days and no more, unless formally renewed, in which case it remains in force for another period of seven days, and so on. Similarly with regard to wages and conditions of employment the Exchanges are required by the General Regulations (Clause IV) to take the standpoint of absolute non-interference. The responsibility of fixing terms rests entirely on employers and workpeople individually or collectively. In this matter the Exchange limits itself to supplying information. It is further provided that

“Copies or summaries of any agreements mutually arranged between associations of employers and workmen for the regulation of wages or other conditions of labour in any trade may, with the consent of the various parties to such agreements, be filed at a labour exchange, and any published rules made by public authorities with regard to like matters may also be filed. Documents so filed shall be open to inspection on application”;

and that

“No person shall suffer any disqualification or be otherwise prejudiced on account of refusing to accept employment found for him

through a Labour Exchange where the ground of refusal is that a trade dispute which affects his trade exists or that the wages offered are lower than those current in the trade in the district where the employment is found."

The only occasion on which an apparently different principle is adopted is when there is question of advancing railroad fare to enable a workman to go to a place where employment awaits him. The General Regulations (Clause V, Section 3) provide that no such advance shall be made where the Labour Exchange official has reason to believe that the vacancy in question is due to a trade dispute or that employment is offered at a rate of wages lower than the rate current in that trade in that district. It is evident, however, on examination, that this provision is really meant to maintain the non-interference policy of the Labour Exchange by keeping it free from even the semblance of providing "blackleg" or "scab" labour.

A final guarantee of impartiality has been provided by the appointment of Advisory Trade Committees to advise and assist the Board of Trade in regard to any matters referred to them in connection with the management of Labour Exchanges. It is provided by the General Regulations (Clause VII, Section 1) that

"There shall be established by the Board of Trade in such areas of the United Kingdom as they think fit advisory trade committees consisting of equal numbers of persons representing employers and workmen in the district and appointed by the Board of Trade after consultation with such bodies and persons as they may think best qualified to advise them on the matter, together with a chairman, agreed upon by a majority both of the persons representing employers and of the persons representing workmen, or in default of such agreement appointed by the Board of Trade."

It is intended that these Advisory Committees shall deal with large areas and not with single Exchanges. It seems as if from their constitution they may be relied on to see that impartiality on the part of Labour Exchange officials as between employers and workpeople shall be strictly observed.

As was to be expected in a country in which unemployment and under-employment on a large scale had been chronic for



a long period, there was a great rush of workpeople to the Labour Exchanges in the beginning. Despite all that had been said in advance as to the purely industrial and non-charitable nature of the new organization, there was a widespread popular delusion that the Labour Exchanges were to be a panacea for industrial ills, a sure means of finding employment for everyone who needed it. The result was that all sorts of people, of whom a large percentage was wholly unemployable, made application to the Exchanges for positions. Thus in February, 1910, while only 21,193 vacancies were notified to the Exchanges, the wholly disproportionate number of 216,813 applications was received from workpeople during that month. Soon, however, it began to be realized that qualifications for the work sought were as necessary in dealing with the Labour Exchange as they would be in dealing directly with an employer. Thereupon there ensued a sudden decrease in the number of applications for employment. Thus, while out of the 21,193 vacancies mentioned above, 12,628 were filled, the number of applications for employment remaining on the registers at the end of the month of February had fallen from 216,813 to 112,424; and while for the first four months both the vacancies notified and the vacancies filled were as a rule on the increase, applicants for employment kept dropping away. This decrease is of course partly accounted for by a general improvement in trade during the period under notice, and partly by the fact that, the vacancies notified not being nearly commensurate with the numbers of those who sought them, many desirable applicants were therefore driven back on the old channels of employment, such as Trade Unions or other agencies; but it is mainly to be attributed to the conviction gradually forced on unemployable and undesirable applicants that the Labour Exchange was no place for them.

In dealing with the latter class of applicants the officials show great tact, discretion, and common sense. They make it their business to find out, by personal interview and outside inquiries, all they can concerning each applicant, and, while they register and re-register every one who comes forward, they are careful, for the sake of the credit of the Exchange as

an employment agency, not to recommend any unsuitable person for any vacancy. Mistakes in this matter were doubtless inevitable at first, and were sometimes made; but, experience teaching, they were never repeated in the case of the same individual. The result was that unemployables and undesirables, seeing that they gained nothing by the Exchange and were merely wasting their time in going there day after day and week after week, dropped gradually away, and eventually ceased almost altogether to register.

So thorough a revolution in the method of bringing the worker and the job together was bound at the outset to be received with a certain amount of scepticism both by capital and labour. For various reasons, among which were the natural inclination to cling to old methods and a certain amount of political prejudice on the part of conservatives against a measure that had emanated from the liberals, employers displayed at first a good deal of hesitation and delay in notifying vacancies; but they have gradually learned the value of the Exchanges to themselves and for that reason are generally co-operating with them. Some of them are disposed to adopt the Exchanges as their regular method of obtaining labour, and have placed notices on their factory or warehouse gates stating that applicants for employment should register at the local Exchange. One is liable to look upon the Labour Exchange system in its bearings on workpeople only, but it must be borne in mind that it is eminently two-sided, being a convenience to employers as well as a help to workers. Formerly a good workman, coming to a factory when he was not wanted, passed on and disappeared. Now, if he follows the instruction directing him to the Exchange and registers there, a permanent record is made of him, and his services may be obtained when required. The growth of the vacancies notified appears to afford evidence that the employers are more and more inclined to avail themselves of the services of the Exchanges. The number of such vacancies was 458,942 in 1910; 788,609 in 1911; 1,062,574 in 1912; and 1,222,828 in 1913.

Unorganized labour naturally had recourse to the Exchanges from the beginning: the case with organized labour ran a very

peculiar course. It is important to note it, because, although the 2,000,000 trade unionists in the United Kingdom are much less than a quarter of the individual manual workers, the position occupied and the power wielded in public life in Great Britain and Ireland by organized labour are very great. Before the introduction of the Labour Exchanges Bill a national conference of trade union delegates convened by the parliamentary committee of the Trade Union Congress resolved unanimously:

"That this conference of trade union delegates representing 1,400,000 trade unionists approves of the establishment of Labour Exchanges on a national basis under the control of the Board of Trade, provided that the managing board contains an equal proportion of employers and representatives of trade unions."

The proviso in that resolution has been to some extent met by the appointment of the Advisory Committees. A further concession to Trade Union sentiment was made by the nomination of men who had been prominent in Trade Union ranks to various posts, both principal and subordinate, in the Exchanges. Whether or not this move had the desired effect is open to question, for, under the strict requirements as to impartiality contained in the Act and the General Regulations, the ex-Trade Union leader as a rule quickly developed into a non-committal Government official, and thereby in some cases earned a good deal of opprobrium from his former fellows.

Since the Act went into operation the attitude of Trade Unions has developed from conditional friendliness through interested watchfulness to criticism and more or less open hostility on certain points and finally to reserved acquiescence. At first a fair number of Trade Unions or branches of Trade Unions instructed all their unemployed members to register regularly at the Exchanges, and some of them had it in contemplation to make such registration and the production of a registration card a condition of receipt of unemployment benefit. Still there were occasional complaints and grumblings. Finally at the Trade Union Congress held at Sheffield in September, 1910, a resolution was passed, by 1,147,000 against 272,000, condemning the Exchanges as thitherto managed; demanding that recognized Trade Union

officials be supplied with the name and address of, and the wages paid by, any firm offering employment through an Exchange; that applicants for situations be not sent outside their own districts unless the firm offering employment recognized Trade Union rates; and that applications from firms having disputes with their workpeople be not entertained by the Exchanges after a dispute had been officially notified by the Trade Union concerned. A hitch which might have had important consequences thus arose; but with the British spirit of compromise at work and the great scheme for insurance against sickness and unemployment following hard upon the heels of the Labour Exchanges Act, a *modus vivendi* was reached and the Exchanges continued to carry on their operations more or less along the lines originally laid down.

With regard to juvenile employment through the Labour Exchanges there was some danger of a conflict between the education authorities and the Board of Trade, but the difficulty has been overcome. Two points in particular have to be seen to in connection with juvenile employment. The first is that boys and girls should be allowed to complete their ordinary school education before going to work, and that after they have gone to work they should be given the opportunity of still further improving themselves by attending night schools or continuation classes. This matter has received and is receiving earnest attention. The second point is that juveniles should, when possible, be prevented from taking up "blind alley" occupations, that is, work that leads nowhither and leaves them stranded, when they have attained to manhood or womanhood, without training or aptitude for a trade or a definite pursuit. This is a complex and a difficult problem, and time alone can show whether, and if so, how the Labour Exchanges can solve it. One way of dealing with it is the use of separate Advisory Committees for Juvenile Employment, from which much resultant good has accrued and still more is expected. To aid the Labour Exchanges and the Local Education Authorities in this matter parliament passed in 1910 the Education (Choice of Employment) Act, which has since been energetically worked and has been found to be of material help.

Allusion has been already made more than once to the advancing of railroad fare to workers to enable them to take up positions at a distance. This is a distinguishing and important feature of the Act, and one that, when fully working, will afford a splendid test of the mobility of labour.<sup>3</sup> These advances are not by way of gift but by way of loan. Naturally they are surrounded by many safe-guards. No advance is made unless to a person going to take up a position secured beforehand through a Labour Exchange. Advances are not made for distances under five miles. The amount of the advance to each individual must not exceed the actual cheapest railroad fare for one person one way between the two points. Thus no allowance is made for the conveyance of wife, husband, children, or dependents, nor is there any allowance for subsistence on the way. As already pointed out, a travelling advance cannot be made when the manager of the Exchange has reason to believe that the employment offered is due to a trade dispute or that the scale of pay arranged is lower than that current in that trade or district. Generally the advance takes the form of a voucher which on presentation to a booking-clerk entitles the holder to receive a railroad ticket. The voucher is afterwards sent to the Labour Exchange, which pays to the railroad company the amount of the fare. It is only in very exceptional cases that the advance to the work person is made in cash. The Exchange arranges beforehand whether it is the employer or the employee that is to refund the amount of the loan. Sometimes it is the employer: occasionally indeed the employer agrees to pay the fare out of his own pocket in order to secure the operative. Generally, however, it is the employee that is responsible for the repayment, and in that case the employer agrees to deduct a fixed instalment from the weekly wages and to forward it to the Exchange until the whole amount

<sup>3</sup> By this expression there is here meant, of course, "place mobility," that is, the ability and readiness to move from one centre of industry to another according to the state of the labour market. I have failed to find in the working of the Labour Exchanges anything that would tend to show "trade mobility," that is, mobility between different trades or different branches of the same trade. This latter form of mobility, or fluidity, as it is also called, is greatly discouraged by Trade Unions in the United Kingdom.

is paid off. It is not to be expected but that some bad debts will be made by the Labour Exchanges in connection with this system; but the advances are generally repaid. From February, 1910, to September 30, 1913, the number of cases in which fares for transportation were thus advanced was about 34,000, and the total amount involved was approximately £10,400.

Another point that seems to deserve attention is that fraudulent misrepresentation is carefully guarded against. Section 3 of the Act provides that if any person knowingly makes any false statement or false representation to a Labour Exchange official for the purpose of obtaining employment or procuring work people, that person shall be liable in respect of each such offence on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding £10.

The table on p. 372 illustrates in a convenient form some of the foregoing statements and in addition gives a good general idea of the working of the Labour Exchanges.

The estimate for the outlay on the Labour Exchanges was £210,000 for 1910-11; £210,000 for 1911-12; £804,539 for 1912-13; and £984,525 for 1913-14.

The Labour Exchange system, big as it was in conception, was meant to be only a part of a gigantic scheme for dealing with distress. For some years past provision for unemployment due to accidents to workpeople had been made by the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 and the Workmen's Compensation Act<sup>4</sup> of 1897, and a further extension was given to the principle of providing in an honorable way for the unemployed or under-em-

<sup>4</sup> Under the Workmen's Compensation Act, when death results from an injury incident to the employment, if a workman leaves any one who was wholly dependent on his earnings, there is payable a sum equal to his earnings in the employment of the same employer during the three years next preceding the injury, or the sum of £150, whichever of those sums is the larger, but not exceeding £350 in any case. If he leaves no such dependants, but only those who are partly dependent on him, a sum less than that which would have been payable as above is agreed or determined upon. When, not death, but total or partial incapacity for work results from the injury, a weekly payment during the incapacity, not exceeding 50 per cent. of his average weekly earnings during the previous twelve months, is payable. It can readily be seen that this Act might hit the small employer hard. Employers generally evade the responsibility by insurance, but the premiums are a tax in themselves.

**REGISTRATIONS, INDIVIDUALS REGISTERED, AND VACANCIES,  
1911, 1912, 1913.**

		Number of Reg- istrations.	Number of Individ- uals Registered.	Number of Vacan- cies (Situations) Notified.	Number of Vacan- cies (Situations) Filled.	Number of Individ- uals Given Work.
Men....	{ 1911	1,323,162	978,211	446,035	362,670	268,794
	{ 1912	1,594,236	1,025,332	626,756	513,649	336,341
	{ 1913	2,038,735	1,267,077	714,270	566,150	390,141
Women.	{ 1911	414,459	307,641	178,446	136,409	97,598
	{ 1912	518,775	360,873	226,276	168,555	118,650
	{ 1913	532,060	351,755	270,325	199,395	133,424
Boys....	{ 1911	185,108	138,684	106,290	77,881	64,752
	{ 1912	200,403	146,434	130,601	88,086	70,565
	{ 1913	186,574	137,668	143,715	90,387	74,535
Girls. ..	{ 1911	117,718	88,833	57,208	44,450	38,066
	{ 1912	151,890	110,948	78,941	57,940	48,153
	{ 1913	158,524	115,171	94,618	65,921	54,206
Total....	{ 1911	2,040,447	1,513,369	788,609	621,410	469,210
	{ 1912	2,465,304	1,643,587	1,062,574	828,230	573,709
	{ 1913	2,965,893	1,871,671	1,222,828	921,853	652,306
<b>Percentage</b>						
<b>increases :—</b>						
1913 over 1912		20.3	13.9	15.1	11.3	13.7
1913 over 1911		45.4	23.7	55.1	48.3	39.0

ployed poor by the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908, which came into operation on January 1, 1909. By this Act a pension not exceeding as a maximum 5s a week is payable to every needy person of good character in the United Kingdom who is over 70 years of age. According to the means of the recipient the pension may go down to 4s, 3s, 2s, or 1s a week, the idea being that those who have other means may by the pension have a total income of 13s a week. These apparently small allowances have been a great boon to thousands of the aged and deserving poor. In comparing values it must be remembered that the purchasing power of 5s. is very much greater in the United Kingdom than the purchasing power of a corresponding amount in the United

States. The result of the working of the Act has been materially to decrease the number of paupers, that is, of those who are relieved by the Poor Law. The total number of paupers in receipt of relief in England and Wales on June 25, 1910, was 762,111 as against 784,434 on June 26, 1909, showing a decrease in the rate of pauperism to population from 22.2 per 1,000 to 21.3 within the twelve months. The extent of this system may be fairly judged from the outlay required. The estimate for 1908-9 was £2,110,000; for 1909-10, £8,750,000; for 1910-11, £9,720,000; for 1911-12, £12,415,000; for 1912-13, £12,200,000; and for 1913-14, £12,600,000.

But, even with those four Acts in operation, the whole field of unemployment was not covered. Accidents are not the only checks to wage-earning during active life, and experience has shown that wage-earning itself generally ceases before the pension age of seventy. Something more was felt to be required in the United Kingdom, if all the exigencies of unemployment were to be met. The next great forward step was the establishment of a system of compulsory national insurance against loss of income through sickness or unemployment, by the passing of the National Insurance Act in 1911. This Act became operative in July, 1912. It may justly be described as one of the most revolutionary and far-reaching enactments ever placed on a statute-book.<sup>5</sup> The estimates for the outlay of the state on this scheme, exclusive of the contributions of employers and employed and other insurers, were £2,040,423 for 1912-13 and £6,514,098 for 1913-14.

The Old Age Pension Act may be regarded as a preparation for, and the National Insurance Act as a most important supplement of, the Labour Exchanges Act. All three taken together form the great charter given to the poor and to workers by the Liberal party since its advent to power on December 5, 1905.

P. J. LENNOX.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

<sup>5</sup> I have given a fairly detailed explanation of the National Insurance Act, under the title "Insuring a Nation," in *The North American Review* of January, 1912.



## CHATEAUBRIAND AND THE AMERICAN INDIAN.

---

To all of us, the name of the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau is familiar, as standing for a "Return to Nature." Now a Return to Nature naturally and necessarily meant the abolition of all conventions and institutions, but it also meant a return to a simple communal state and a faith in the worth of man, in his ability to apprehend truth emotionally. It is the combination of these two ideas that gives Rousseau his double worth. As an assailant of the institutions which corrupt men, especially of government, and as an advocate of the worth of the individual, he was a Revolutionist. "His writings were the Jacobin creed. Robespierre and Saint-Just were his apostles. The Terror was his millenium." As an advocate of the emotional and sentimental, he was forerunner of the reactionary romanticists of France. In his second Discourse on Inequality he had exalted Indian life as something "intermediate between the indolence of the primitive state and the petulant activity of self-love now seen in the world." He had exploited the Indians as Voltaire had exploited the Chinese,—with little comprehension of their true condition. He had emphasized the fact that Indian tribes were governed by an intellectual aristocracy and had loudly proclaimed the freedom of the savage.

Then, when France was disillusioned with liberty, in the midst of reaction, Chateaubriand, Saint-Pierre, and Madame du Staël turned back to the sentimentalism of Rousseau which had been so popular in the France of Louis XVI. The romantic spirit in France thus emphasized emotion rather than thought. For example, in the field of religion, natural revulsion from Danton's Goddess of Reason on the Altar of Notre-Dame turned emotionally from the unbridled "reign of reason" to strong legitimate authority, to the Faith of the Catholic Church. Chateaubriand said: "I explain the Gospel, not in the interest of despotism, but as a comfort for the sorrowing";

and Lamennais marked the furthest reaction from irreverent rationalism when he declared: "All truths indispensable to mankind have been revealed by God, preserved by tradition, and safeguarded by authority . . . developed into Christianity, set before us in the Catholic Church, and embodied in her head."<sup>1</sup>

In 1802, on the eve of Napoleon's reconciliation with the Church and signing of the Concordat, Chateaubriand issued the *Génie du Christianisme*, the book which places him historically as chief representative of the reaction and "the most conspicuous figure in French Literature during the First Empire."<sup>2</sup> This volume, an inspired eulogy rather than a reasonable study,<sup>3</sup> attained great popularity<sup>4</sup> and wide influence.<sup>5</sup> One writer said: "He reinstated religion in the world."<sup>6</sup>

Chateaubriand was a very prominent political figure in France during the years immediately following the overthrow of Napoleon until the revolution of 1830.<sup>7</sup> He himself tells<sup>8</sup> how in the American wilderness he read in a paper of the Flight to Varennes and the capture of the King. "The journal also told of the progress of the *émigration* and the reunion

<sup>1</sup> *Cambridge Modern History*, x, 5.

<sup>2</sup> 11 ed. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* gives higher praise and says, "The whole literary movement characteristic of the nineteenth century begins with him. Admitting that he had predecessors and that his style is reminiscent of J.-J. Rousseau, he undoubtedly inaugurated a new literature."

<sup>3</sup> Etienne Pierre de Sénancour, *Observations critiques sur l'ouvrage intitulé Génie du Christianisme*, etc. Paris, 1816: "le style est remarquable . . . ne peut être lu sans impatience par quiconque veut écouter la raison, et désire connaître le vrai."

<sup>4</sup> 105 ed. are listed in *Catalogue Général des livres imprimés de la bibliothèque nationale*, tome 27.

<sup>5</sup> Vide: Beranek, *Chateaubriand über die Engländer und Franzosen*, Bielitz, 1885; Buhling, *Le Génie d. dans l'hist. d. l. littér. française*, Halberstadt, 1894; W. S. Lilly, *Notes on Chateaubriand*, 19th century, 69: 651.

<sup>6</sup> The Abbé Pradt, quoted in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

<sup>7</sup> Vide: Albert Cassagne, *La vie politique de François de Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1911, who renders high praise to him as one of the greatest statesmen of France.

<sup>8</sup> *Voyage en Amérique*, ed. Paris, 1828, 2: 157-158.

of almost all the officers of the French Army under the flag of the French Prince. I thought I heard the voice of honour and I gave up my plans,"<sup>9</sup> says Chateaubriand. From the time when the conservative majority of 1816 defeated the Duc de Richelieu, Chateaubriand remained high in favour with Louis XVIII and with Charles X. Reverting from chaotic rational iconoclasm, he studied an idealised past<sup>10</sup> and held to the doctrine of complete and lasting union between the altar and the throne. He professed to believe in the principles of the French Revolution but to "dislike the violences which dishonoured it"<sup>11</sup> and which has needlessly assailed venerable institutions. He stood for reaction.<sup>12</sup> He represented France at the Congress of Verona, where the stalwart conservatives Castlereagh, Wellington and Metternich represented England and Austria.<sup>13</sup> Later, as time went on, he fell out with Charles X; and in 1831, in a paper entitled "*Concerning the Restoration and the Elective Monarchy*," he declared: "I am a Bourbon as a matter of honour, royalist according to reason and conviction, and republican by taste and character." He seems to have believed in a constitutional monarchy<sup>14</sup>—an attitude that was "republican" in 1831.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Vide: *Les Martyrs*, Paris and Lyons, 1810 and other ed. *Analyse de l'histoire de France*, Paris, 1850. *Considerations sur le génie des hommes, des temps, et des revolutions*, Paris, 1849. *Discours servants d'introduction à l'histoire de France, lu dans la séance tenue par l'Académie . . . Française . . . etc.*, Paris, 1826. *Études ou discours historiques sur la chute de l'Empire Romain, la naissance et les progrès du Christianisme, et l'invasion des barbares*, Paris, 1852.

<sup>11</sup> Vide: Pref. of *Essai sur les Revolutions*; also, intro. of *Voyage en Amérique*, ed. Paris, 1828, 1: 84, 99, 100, 104, 164.

<sup>12</sup> Vide: *De Napoleon et des Bourbons; et de la nécessité des rallier à nos princes légitimes*, Paris, 1814; a London edition of the same professedly done "*pour le bonheur de France et celui de l'Europe*," 1814; a London trans. 1814; a German trans. Berlin, 1814; an Italian trans., Padua, 1814; a *Supplément*, Paris, 1814; also trans. at Milan, 1814; vide also St. Edme, *De l'Empereur Napoleon, Refutation de l'écrit de M. Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1814.

<sup>13</sup> Vide: Chateaubriand, *Congrès de Vérone*, Bruxelles, 1838; also Paris, 1838; Leipzig, 1838; a London trans. 1838.

<sup>14</sup> Vide: *De la monarchie selon la charte*, Paris, 1816; London, 1816;

I have gone so much into detail regarding his political career in order to indicate the character and temperament of the man and to suggest that this political prominence may have had something to do with his literary vogue though the reverse is as likely to be true. There is little doubt, though, that the writings unaided have obtained for him no small distinction. The publication of his great book rendered an influence principal which had once been incidental.<sup>15</sup> "The author of the *Génie du Christianisme* remained forever the advocate of poetry and religion, the Knight of the Cross, the Champion of Jesus Christ."<sup>16</sup>

In 1801 he had published an Indian story, *Atala*. In 1805, this tale was reissued with another slightly similar piece called *René*. The Indians whom Chateaubriand presented were somewhat like the "noble savage" of Rousseau or the simple "man of nature" of Wordsworth. By this is meant that his Indians were not true Indians, his savages were not true savages, they were what a highly civilized and well-educated man of romantic inclinations *might* conceive savages *might* be. In other words, the Indian of Chateaubriand, as the ideal men of Rousseau and Wordsworth, was the personality of the writer projected into savage conditions with a temperament so developed as to enjoy emotionally the beauties of Nature.<sup>17</sup> *Atala* and *René*, more than any other works, gave distinction to the name of Chateaubriand among his contemporaries. Since 1805, he has been considered for France the literary innovator, the regenerator of romance.<sup>18</sup>

It has been previously suggested elsewhere that the vogue of Chateaubriand had much to do with the singular reception

a London trans., 1816; also, W. S. Lilly, *Notes on Chateaubriand*, 19th century, 69: 1066.

<sup>15</sup> Vide: Albert Cassagne, *op. cit.*, avant-propos: "Il fut homme d'action par essence et poète par accident. Comme, du fait des circonstances et grâce aux admirables moyens d'expression dont bénéficia Chateaubriand, l'accident est, aux yeux de la postérité, devenu l'essentiel."

<sup>16</sup> M. F. A. de Lescure: *Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1892, p. 151.

<sup>17</sup> Pref. *Voyage en Amérique*, ed. Paris, 1828, pp. 76-78 read like an extract from Rousseau. Also, pp. 250, 253, 272.

<sup>18</sup> Lescure, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

which the French reading public accorded to the novels of Cooper, and also much to do with the difference of the attitude of the French critics from the attitude of the English and the American reviewers. The Cooper books were read with avidity,—most of them were translated within a year of their first appearance in America,—read with avidity by a people which had been educated to a romantic view of America, by a people for whose benefit the Indian had been exploited as the ideal man next to Nature through “a wild succession of wild imaginings of American life and scenery.” Thus it happened that, while the American reviewers of Cooper referred to facts,<sup>19</sup> and even accused Cooper of idealisation,<sup>20</sup> and charged that he had merely transfigured and exalted Indians plagiarized out of Heckewelder;<sup>21</sup> and while the English, prepared by innumerable volumes of American travel, took his descriptions for fact, treated him as a realist,<sup>22</sup> and charged that he had degraded the Indians;<sup>22</sup> the French insisted on taking him as a romanticist and comparing him with Scott.

It would be best, before we start to show the influence of the Chateaubriand vogue on the criticism of Cooper, to take a survey of Chateaubriand's America. In the preface to *Atala*, Chateaubriand remarked: “I do not know if the public will like this story, which leaves all beaten paths and presents a nature and manners entirely foreign to Europe. . . . It is a sort of a poem, part descriptive, part dramatic, and consists entirely in a picture of two lovers who walk and talk in the solitude, in a picture of the passions of love in the midst of the calm of the wilderness.”<sup>24</sup> The tale is the story of the return to Nature of the old Indian Chactas, of his affection for the beautiful Atala, of their mutual happiness and love, and of her death by the side of a woodland chancel. *René* is the tale of two who have both “sadness in the depths

<sup>19</sup> Francis Parkman in *No. Amer. Rev.*, Jan., 1852.

<sup>20</sup> *North American Review*, July, 1826.

<sup>21</sup> *No. Amer. Rev.*, April, 1828; Heckewelder, *On the Indians*.

<sup>22</sup> *Edinburgh Rev.*, 1829, 50: 128; 1835, 51: 24; 1849, 89: 91.

<sup>23</sup> *Blackwood's*, 1824, 16: 427.

<sup>24</sup> *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Garnier,—3: 3.

of their hearts.”<sup>25</sup> As brother and sister they grow into a beautiful and true sympathy towards one another. Finally, as the story runs, Amelie hastens away to enter a convent; René follows after, intent on interfering with her reception; but he is overmastered by the glorious sweet sadness of the scene, and by the marvelous influence of religion;<sup>26</sup> and so desists. He goes then to America, to plunge himself into Solitude and to seek consolation in the depths of the forest.

The distinctive thing about these tales, as in the other works of Chateaubriand, seems to be their exaggeration of the sentimental and romantic phase of each incident.<sup>27</sup> Nature is used as a background to the soul of man. It was the use of local colours and the audacity of description, combined with strong sentiment, that rendered Chateaubriand unique. At the suggestion of contemporary critics, he made some minor changes in later editions but the story remained essentially romantic. A recent writer has remarked that “Chateaubriand’s Indians are blood relations of Richardson’s heroines. No other beings ever possessed so much sensibility, such delicate nerves. Enough tears are shed in his romances to irrigate the desert lands of Arizona and to make the barren plains of New Mexico blossom like the rose. Young men and maidens, old men and lusty warriors, all dissolve in tears. Once they flowed in such torrents that they could be heard.”<sup>28</sup> We will quote a single short paragraph to illustrate the peculiar mood of Chateaubriand: Céluta entered the hut, blushing, passed in front of the strangers, bent over to the matron’s ear, said a few words to her in a low voice, and retired. Her dress, made of the white bark of the mulberry tree, waved gently behind her, and two pink heels raised the edge at every step. The air remained scented, where she had passed, with the odour

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 75.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 3: 90.

<sup>27</sup> This tendency appears in the relation of historical events, *Pref. Hist. de Voyages*, in *Voyage en Amérique*, 1828, 1: 60.

<sup>28</sup> E. K. Armstrong, “Chateaubriand in America,” *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn. Amer.*, 1907, 22: 345 ff. It is interesting to read Chateaubriand’s defense of the use of tears, *Pref. to Atala, Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Garnier, 3: 3-4.

of magnolia blooms which surrounded her head: thus did Hero appear at the fêtes of Abydos, thus did Venus reveal herself in the Carthaginian woods, by her bearing and the ambrosial odour which her hair scattered about."<sup>29</sup> The Indian women wear veils made of bark; and one even went in swimming with a veil on. In florid language and elegant style, Chateaubriand wrote vividly of the luxuriance of the forest and the gorgeous drapery of leaves. Into the hearts of the savages he instilled a high idealism; and the crudities of their wilderness life he covered with the glamour of old romance.<sup>30</sup> Chateaubriand's America was a world of dreams.<sup>31</sup>

*Les Natchez* and the *Voyage en Amérique*, two later publications, while they had not so much influence nor so great a sale as *Atala* and *René*, are nevertheless interesting in their further revelation of Chateaubriand's conception of the Indian.<sup>32</sup> The *Voyage en Amérique*, which pretends to be merely a record of travel through New York and down the Mississippi, with some supplementary information, is very vague and indefinite as to dates and places, suggestive and general as to customs and laws,<sup>33</sup> and very enthusiastic over the pleasantness of the life and the nobility of the Indian character. Chateaubriand praises almost everything,<sup>34</sup> even finding excuse for the bad.<sup>35</sup> Cruel customs are held up, not as

<sup>29</sup> *Les Natchez, Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Garnier, 3: 190.

<sup>30</sup> *Voyage en Amérique*, ed. Paris, 1828, 2: 159, "Pourquoi les solitudes de l'Erie et de l'Ontario se présentent-elles aujourd'hui avec plus de charme à ma pensée, que le brillant spectacle du Bosphore? C'est qu'à l'époque de mon voyage aux Etats-Unis j'étais plein d'illusion."

<sup>31</sup> Georges Bertrin, who wrote the *Catholic Encyclopedia* article, has written, in defense, *Problèmes d'hist. littér. à propos de Chateaubriand, Le Correspondant*, 198 (n. s. 162): 914 ff.; 200 (n. s. 164): 113 ff. "En 1791 . . . à 23 ans . . . lecteur enthousiaste de J.-J. Rousseau, il aspirait à poursuivre le bonheur loin de la société des hommes, il brûlait de contempler cette idéale Nature, libre et sauvage, dont on célébrait chaleureusement le beauté."

<sup>32</sup> *Voyage en Amérique*, ed. Paris, 1828,—1: 211, 227, 130-131.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 224, 304.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 37, 38-9, 220; 2: 42, 52.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 227, 236, 272, 285-6—"Du seul examen de ces langues il résulte que des peuples par nous surnommés *Sauvages* étoient fort avancées dans cette civilisation qui tient à la combinaison des idées. Les détails de leur gouvernement confirmeront de plus en plus cette vérité."

specimens of cruelty, but as evidences of nobility of character. The lack of old monuments is compensated by the impressive monuments of Nature and of Liberty, "*mère de toute société humaine.*"<sup>36</sup> The physical slavery of the women is compensated, in Chateaubriand's mind, by their high standing in family matters and in the councils of the tribe.<sup>37</sup>

Throughout the work there are many charming descriptions or ordinary phenomena which might easily have been imagined, or even seen, in France,—all in the most flowery language. With avidity the author seizes upon any ruins, any relics of the past, any indications of a pristine greatness.<sup>38</sup> "Whatever they may be now, an unknown nation, a nation superior to the present generation of Indians, has lived in this wilderness. What was this nation? What change has destroyed it?"<sup>40</sup> This was the revival of the past, so characteristic of Romanticism. The natives themselves are shown with a high regard for reason, justice, and honour.<sup>41</sup> There is praise for their ingenuity, their reverence for age and wisdom, their kind and generous primitive hospitality;<sup>42</sup> and *mirabile dictu*, even for their religion.<sup>43</sup> Civilization,—Protestant civilization of course,—is arraigned severely for the evils it has wrought, from 1791-1827,<sup>44</sup> for the almost complete destruction of the noble and truly American character,<sup>45</sup> for the introduction of strong liquors, for the sickness brought in, for the destructive wars,<sup>46</sup> for moral and religious corruption,<sup>47</sup> and for stimulus to deceit in trading.<sup>48</sup> The life which Chateaubriand depicts is not truly a savage life;—it is a primitive civilization based on natural principles rather than false conventions, a civilization comparable to those of the noblest nations of antiquity, the Greeks, the Romans, and the Hebrews.<sup>49</sup> It is to be noticed that Chateaubriand takes pains to free the

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 99.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 130-131, 149 ff., 195.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 163.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 123, 124.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 119-120, 124. Vol. I.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 103.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 110-111.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 82.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 161, 100, 190.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 1: 132, 134.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 42.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 94.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 105.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 103-4.



Catholic Church from blame in this degradation. The Faith had helped, he said, to soften the ferocious characteristics. "It was in the name of a God sacrificed by men that the Missionaries obtained the abolition of human sacrifices; they planted the Cross in the place of the torture stake, and the blood of Jesus Christ saved the blood of the prisoner."<sup>50</sup> The French spirit and the Catholic Faith were consistent with, and proper for, the noble character of the Indian. The separation did much harm.<sup>51</sup>

As early as 1827, in the *American Quarterly Review*,<sup>52</sup> objection was registered against Chateaubriand's *Atala* on the grounds that the picture of Indian life was false. An English magazine, the *Foreign and Continental Miscellany* in 1828, also spoke in the same tone.<sup>53</sup> Later the *Voyage en Amerique* has been attacked and classed as a fiction, rather than truth. Gribble,<sup>54</sup> declared that, if, as is stated, Chateaubriand embarked 8 April 1791, arrived at Baltimore 10 July 1791, and re-embarked at Philadelphia 10 December 1791, under the conditions then existing, it was not possible for a person to make the journey supposedly recorded in that time. Bédier<sup>55</sup> declared the journeys false, saying that Chateaubriand could have gone no further than Niagara in the time indicated, and that we cannot even be sure that Chateaubriand visited Philadelphia.<sup>56</sup> Bédier charged plagiarism and mentioned five works of travel on which he believed Chateaubriand had drawn.<sup>57</sup> A single dissenting voice,<sup>58</sup> a man who had lived in the Ohio country through which Chateaubriand had gone, pro-

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 2: 40.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 106-107, 118.

<sup>52</sup> December, p. 46.

<sup>53</sup> 1: 468.

<sup>54</sup> *Chateaubriand and his Court of Women*, Chap. IV.

<sup>55</sup> *Chateaubriand en Amerique, vérité et fiction*, Rev. d'hist. littér. de la France, v. 6, 501 ff.; 7: 59 ff.; 8: 80 ff.; later reprinted in *Études Critiques*, Paris, 1903.

<sup>56</sup> 6: 526-7: "Chateaubriand n'a pas visité les régions où son imagination a si longtemps vécu."—p. 532.

<sup>57</sup> *Études Critiques*, p. 196.—Charlevoix, Paris, 1774; Bartram, Phila., 1791; Carver, London, 1792; Le Page du Pratz, Paris, 1758; Bonnet, Paris, 1795.

<sup>58</sup> Mr. Madison Statters, *Chateaubriand et l'Amerique*, Grenoble, 1906.

tested in 1905 that the journey could have been made in the specified time, and he attempted to defend Chateaubriand's picture of the Indians. But probably the most damaging article of all appeared the same year from the pen of M. Ernst Dick.<sup>58</sup> This writer declared that there had been no "vieux manuscrit" dating from before 1800 from which Chateaubriand had professed to draw *Atala*, *René*, *Voyage en Amérique*, and *Les Natchez*, and that the *Voyage en Amérique* was not a work "entièrement rédigé," but a composition dating later than 1824.<sup>60</sup> He added to Bédier's list of *sources* two new titles.<sup>61</sup> One of these, a travel book by a certain J. C. Beltrami, he claimed to have been the chief basis of the *Voyage en Amérique*; he quoted in parallel columns many long passages to convict Chateaubriand of deliberate plagiarism;<sup>62</sup> he pointed out that the *Foreign and Continental Miscellany* had offered the same charge in 1828; he recalled that Chateaubriand cites Beltrami three times; he suggested that Chateaubriand, the eminent statesman, had purchased the silence of Beltrami the insignificant judiciary; and he quoted a Preface by Beltrami to another work: "M. Chateaubriand a bien voulu me citer avec éloges et m'emprunter quelques pages dans son *Voyage en Amérique*." <sup>63</sup>

The great French critic, Sainte-Beuve, had criticised Chateaubriand rather harshly about the middle of the century;<sup>64</sup> and of recent years, aside from the work of Bédier and of Dick, W. Wright Roberts has accused him of imitating and even of plagiarizing from the Scotch poet James Beattie, from Milton's minor poems as well as from *Paradise Lost*,<sup>65</sup> from James

<sup>58</sup> *Plagiats de Chateaubriand*, Bern, 1905.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46-51.

<sup>60</sup> Beltrami, *Pilgrimage*, New Orleans, 1824; Eng. trans., London, 1825; Mackenzie, *Hist. Fur Trade*, London, 1801.

<sup>61</sup> *Plagiats, etc.*, pp. 5-45.

<sup>62</sup> Pref. to *La Mexique*, Paris, 1830. *Plagiats, etc.*, pp. 1-5.

<sup>63</sup> Ste.-Beuve: *Étude sur Chateaubriand*, Oeuvres complètes, 1861, ed. Do.: *Chateaubriand et son group littéraire sous l'empire*, 1878. Victor Giraud: *Chateaubriand; études littéraires*, Paris, 1911. Do.: *Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1912.

<sup>64</sup> This does not refer to Chateaubriand's translation.

Thomson's *Seasons*, and even a phrase from Shakespeare."<sup>66</sup> Two writers in the *Modern Language Review*,<sup>67</sup> have traced plagiarism of an incident in *Les Natchez* from an Indian tale by Mrs. Sarah Wentworth Morton, published in Boston, 1790, entitled *Oubai, or the Virtues of Nature*. They have referred to a reprint of the incident in *Spectateur du Nord*, "*revue fondée a Hamburg*," with the explanatory words: "le fond de ce conte est tiré d'un poème anglais imprimé à Boston, sous le titre: The Virtues of Nature."

The latest, and it seems to me the best, of the defenses of Chateaubriand appeared in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* in 1909, written by Pierre Martine.<sup>68</sup> He points out several early references in other writings of Chateaubriand to the old manuscript. His chief thesis for Chateaubriand turns on the meaning of the word "*extrait*, au sens que ce mot a vers 1800." He shows that Chateaubriand shortly returned from America, very naturally reviewed for the various publications with which he was connected several books of travel, especially the Mackenzie book; and that these *extraits* in the book reviews—each a sort of quotation with a running fire of the reviewer's comment, in their original manuscripts, were joined with authentic American notes, dating from before 1800 and with pages written 1825-1827 in the midst of enthusiasm over America and of anti-Napoleonic sentiment—all put together in haste to meet a popular demand, and in many places authenticated and elaborated from Beltrami.

But, plagiarist or none, the essential point which we shall note is that the picture which Chateaubriand drew for the French was essentially untrue, imagined romance, not fact. Miss Emma Kate Armstrong in the 1907 publication of the Modern Language Association of America has shown the falsity of Chateaubriand's representation by merely stating the facts of the *Voyage* in plain unelaborated succession.<sup>69</sup> It is easy to

<sup>66</sup> *Quelques sources anglaises de Chateaubriand*, Rev. d'hist. littér. d. l. France, année, p. 98 ff.

<sup>67</sup> January, 1913, 8: 15.

<sup>68</sup> 16: pp. 429-478.

<sup>69</sup> Volume 22, pp. 345-370.

see, as Miss Armstrong has put it, that tropical foliage does not grow, nor tropical birds and animals live, in Central New York. She finds his descriptions faulty at almost every turn of the narrative. Research has discovered in the United States Government archives the letter of introduction which Chateaubriand bore to Washington,<sup>70</sup> and also discovered in a Baltimore Catholic seminary a contemporary manuscript in which a priest mentions Chateaubriand's presence on board the Saint-Pierre on the 1791 voyage.<sup>71</sup> Miss Armstrong concludes: "A careful examination of Chateaubriand's works shows that two of his statements about his visit to America may be accepted without hesitation: he came to Baltimore, and his letter of introduction from the Marquis de la Rouerie was received by Washington."<sup>72</sup> For the rest, we shall take the works as inspired romance. Such was their influence.

Chateaubriand was the first European writer to make America the scene and the Indian the subject of his romances. He returned from America, throbbing with the harmonies of solitude. What though *Atala* was not, as he said, written "sous les huttes des sauvages,"<sup>73</sup> what though the muse which inspired him in the "enchanted"<sup>74</sup> country of the *Natchez* did not march "devant les pas du voyageur, à travers les régions inconnues du Nouveau-Monde pour lui découvrir les secrets ravissants des déserts,"<sup>75</sup> what though he was romancing, even in the ostensibly authentic *Voyage*, and was not, as he claimed to be, a "faithful historian?"<sup>76</sup> What of all these when "*Il a renouvelé pour un siècle l'imagination française.*"<sup>77</sup>

This America then, the America of Chateaubriand, an America of fiction and romance rather than fact, had been exploited before the French nation. His Indians were noble and enlightened, subject to true emotions, and cognizant of the meaning and power of the Catholic Faith. It was this type of Indian with which Cooper's Indians had to compete, when the Leather-Stocking tales were translated into French. Cha-

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 351.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 370.

<sup>73</sup> Preface to *Atala*.

<sup>74</sup> *Voyage en Amérique*, ed. Paris, 1828, 1: 202.

<sup>75</sup> Preface to *Les Natchez*.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup> Bédier, *op. cit.*, 6: 501.

teaubriand had been popular. The *Voyage en Amerique* was issued separately 29 times in the nineteenth century, six of these before 1840; *Les Natchez*, 18 times, four before 1840; *Atala*, or *Atala et René*, 52 times, 16 before 1840, and the *Oeuvres complètes* 48 times, 22 before 1840.<sup>78</sup> There have been innumerable extracts and selections, though most of these since 1840. Then, too, it must not be forgotten that *Atala* and *René* were included as incidents in *Le Génie du Christianisme*, and that much of the vogue of that book has been attributed to the success of these two tales.<sup>79</sup> The figures for the editions of the *Génie du Christianisme* are 48 for the nineteenth century and 13 before 1840. The figures for the editions during the whole century indicate the popularity of Chateaubriand in France, a popularity with which Cooper had to compete.<sup>80</sup> The figures for the editions before 1840 show to some degree how the Chateaubriand idea, false as it was, was already well established in France when Cooper began to bid for favour. I took the date 1840 with reference to Chateaubriand because it will be remembered that Cooper's reputation in France did not begin to gain headway among the critics until 1831, although a "reading public" stimulated by La Fayette's visit to America, had early been enthusiastic over the Cooper books themselves.

Cooper sold well, then, to a people nourished on Chateaubriand. We have mentioned, earlier in this paper, that the French, in contradistinction to the English and the American reviewers, insisted on regarding Cooper as a romancer.<sup>81</sup> As such, the American novelist received what Balzac called "l'admiration passionnée de la France."<sup>82</sup> Thus one writer called him "le vraie poète de l'Amerique;"<sup>83</sup> the *Globe* per-

<sup>78</sup> These facts have been extracted from a bibliography built on the basis of editions in *C.U.L.*, *N.Y.P.L.*, *British Museum Cat.*, and *Catalogue Général de la bibliothèque nationale*, Paris, 1906.

<sup>79</sup> Lescure, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

<sup>80</sup> French ed. only are given.

<sup>81</sup> Morris Cooper in "Nineteenth Century Criticism in France" gives a rather full summary of the bare facts of Cooper's critical reputation. From that most of the facts in the preceding paragraph are drawn.

<sup>82</sup> *Revue parisienne*, 1840, p. 72.

<sup>83</sup> Louis de Loménie, *Galerie des contemporains illustres*, 1845.

sistently compared him with Scott;<sup>84</sup> as a romanticist he was accused of being cold, colourless, dry, over-descriptive, and sterile in invention,<sup>85</sup> and of lacking style and artistic beauty equal to Scott;<sup>86</sup> but he was granted the credit of being somewhat more true to life<sup>87</sup> where he was less poetic.<sup>88</sup>

Critics pointed to the preface of the Leather-Stocking Series where Cooper claimed "the privilege of all writers of fiction" and held that Cooper thought himself a romancer.<sup>89</sup> George Sand quoted Cooper's elaborate praise of "the temple of the wilderness"<sup>90</sup> and gave a long speech of Nathaniel to a white as follows:

"Je ne dis rien contre votre civilisation, contre vos arts, vos monuments, votre commerce, vos religions, vos prêtres. Tout cela est beau et bon sans doute; mais ici, dans mon désert j'habite un plus beau temple que vos églises; je contemple de plus sublimes monuments que ceux élevés par l'homme; je comprends mieux la Divinité que vos prêtres."<sup>91</sup>

She speaks of Cooper in relation to Chateaubriand as follows:

"Plus vrai et plus renseigné que Chateaubriand n'avait fait qu'entrevoir et supposer, il nous a fait pénétrer dans la réalité comme dans la poésie de la vie sauvage, dans ses vertus homériques, dans son héroïsme effrayant, dans sa sublime barbarie."<sup>92</sup>

\* \* \* \*

I believe I have shown to some degree at least what I set out to show—what sort of a man Chateaubriand created for an Indian, the degree of truth in the picture and a connection between the vogue of the Chateaubriand idea and the singular reception accorded Cooper by the French, a connection which tended to make the French critics compare the Indians of Cooper, not with fact, but with the romantic fiction of Chateaubriand.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

<sup>84</sup> Ziesung: *Le Globe et l'Ecole romantique*, 1880.

<sup>85</sup> Philarète, Charles, *Études sur la littér. anglo-amér.*, 1851; 50.

<sup>86</sup> See note 3.      <sup>87</sup> Charles, *op. cit.*, "S'il est prosaïque, il est vrai."

<sup>88</sup> See note 3.      <sup>89</sup> Charles Philarète, *op. cit.*

<sup>90</sup> *Autour du table* (1856), p. 270. *La Nouvelle Revue*, 16: 1882, p. 138, compares Longfellow's Indians to Chateaubriand's Indians.

<sup>91</sup> *Autour du Table*, p. 270.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.

## THE MALTHUSIAN PRINCIPLE OF POPULATION.

---

### II

In the April number of the *BULLETIN* there was given an account of the "principle of population" together with some of the chief sources from which Malthus derived his theory. The present paper will undertake to weigh the merits of that theory.

There was a vast literature on population before the time of Malthus. Malthus carved out of this body of literature what he conceived to be its essential truth and gave it his name and a formulation of his own. Since the time of Malthus the discussion of theories of population has increased, and on account of the prominence attained by Malthus, it has seemed necessary for later writers to align themselves either on his side of the discussion or in opposition to him. However, there are no writers today who accept the Malthusian statement in its entirety, and there are few, if any, who really reject it totally. The difference of opinion today is largely a difference as to how the principle is to be stated.

Malthus states the principle in its crassest form in the first edition of his *Essay*. It is essentially this: Population when unchecked increases in a geometrical ratio; subsistence increases at most in an arithmetical ratio. An absolutely necessary consequence of these facts is misery; a highly probable consequence, although not absolutely necessary, is vice. A second formulation of the principle is contained in the second and succeeding editions. It differs from the first in that, along with misery and vice, *moral restraint* is given as one of the means by which population is kept within the bounds of subsistence, and by moral restraint is meant "a restraint from marriage from prudential motives, with a conduct strictly moral during the period of this restraint." The geometrical and arithmetical ratios are to be found in all of the editions of the *Essay*, and, as being easily stated and understood, they did much to popularize

Malthus's name. On this account those critics are not wholly to blame who insist upon judging the Malthusian claims on the basis of the merits of these ratios. On the other hand, many critics feel that Malthus made a real contribution to a clear understanding of the problem of population and that it is only fair to his memory to overlook some of the over-statements which he made in the excess of his zeal for his "principle." Perhaps for the majority of these critics a third statement of the principle might be formulated thus: Population naturally tends to increase more rapidly than food, and consequently the world is kept from being overstocked through the operation of the checks of misery, vice, and moral restraint. A fourth and somewhat milder formulation of the Malthusian principle is that of Giddings (*Principles of Sociology*, p. 336): "In any given state of industry and the arts population tends to increase faster than it is possible to raise the general plane of living."

It will be readily seen that the difference between the first and the last of the above formulations is considerable. The first says that population does actually crowd upon subsistence so persistently that misery necessarily results and that vice practically results. The last says that *if* the methods of production are not improved in the meantime, the tendency of population to increase will work effectually against the efforts of the people to improve their general well-being. But since it often, if not usually, happens that an increase of population results in a change in the methods of production Giddings's formulation of the principle is far from the pessimism of the original theory. He believes, however, that it has sufficient bite in it to warrant his conclusion that "when industry is static, as socialism would make it forever, the full rigor of the Malthusian law must be felt, and socialism must prove to be only the negative complement of the perpetual motion delusion."

The first and second formulations given above take the geometrical and arithmetical ratios for granted. It was these ratios which popularized the "principle," but with their overthrow, it is merely injured, not killed, and it falls back on the third line of defences. Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio, Malthus tells us, while food supply in-



creases in an arithmetical ratio. Of course, population does not actually increase in a geometrical ratio for any great length of time, Malthus would say, but the reason that it does not do so is that it is "checked," *i. e.*, the people die off or are not born because of lack of food, bad sanitation, and vice, and for other reasons (which he denominates checks.) It is sometimes urged against Malthus's reasoning at this point that he has no right to compare a possible increase of population with an actual increase of food. He should, it is argued, compare his abstract geometrical ratio of population, not with a concrete and actual arithmetical increase in food supply, but with a hypothetical geometrical ratio of increase in animal and vegetable food due to the fact that plant and animal life have an abstract tendency to increase in geometrical ratio. To the present writer there does not seem to be any merit in this criticism. As good a case could be made against the physicist who works out a hypothetical law of falling bodies and then compares his law with what actually happens when a body falls. If he finds that his law does not correspond to the concrete facts of the case, he is well warranted in examining and explaining the "checks" which account for the variation between the hypothetical and the actual. A valid criticism of Malthus's ratios, it seems to the present writer, will be concerned with his facts rather than with his method.

Has population a tendency to increase in geometrical ratio, or, more definitely, is the procreative instinct in man such that in the absence of counteracting checks, population would double itself at least once every twenty-five years? It is not easy to give an entirely satisfactory answer to this question on statistical grounds, for the reason that we do not find any populations which are increasing absolutely without check. It took Germany nearly a hundred years in the nineteenth century to double its population. In the same time the French increased in numbers only forty-five per cent. These figures are far below the demands of Malthus's statement, but then, it must be remembered that the Malthusian checks of misery, vice, and moral restraint, as well as other checks, have been at work in holding down the numbers during the time of these increases. These

statistics, therefore, neither confirm nor overthrow the Malthusian contention.

Where such influences as immigration and emigration need not be considered, increases and decreases in numbers result from the relation between the birth-rate and the death-rate. It is usual to consider the death-rate as the average number of deaths per year to a thousand of the population. Likewise the birth-rate is usually based upon the number of births to a thousand of the population, although for certain statistical purposes, this "crude" birth-rate is sometimes rejected in favor of the number of births per thousand women of child-bearing ages, or per thousand married women of child-bearing ages. Where the crude birth-rate exceeds the death-rate by 30, we have a doubling of population in less than twenty-five years. That we do not often find so great a surplus of births over deaths does not argue so much an absence of the necessary instinct in human beings for procreation, as the existence of "checks." An examination of some of the statistics, while not proving it, will at least suggest the existence of the instinct in sufficient strength to establish the possibility of a geometrical increase as rapid as was assumed by Malthus. In recent years there has been a falling off in the death-rate in all European countries, due to the increasing knowledge of the rules of health and improved sanitation. Along with this decreased death-rate, there has been likewise a universal decrease in the "crude" birth-rate. It seems more reasonable to charge the decreasing birth-rate up to vice and moral restraint and other preventive checks than to a change in the instinct to procreate. Taking this view of the matter, European populations are far from increasing as rapidly as they would increase if "unchecked." In Italy, for example, in 1885, the birth-rate was 38.7 per thousand and the death-rate was 27.1, leaving an effective surplus of 11.6 with which to augment the population. In 1907 Italy's birth-rate was 31.4, and her death-rate was 20.8, making a surplus of 10.6 births over deaths. If Italy's birth-rate had not fallen between 1885 and 1907, while this great improvement was being made in the death-rate, the surplus for 1907 would have been 17.9 as against the actual 10.6 surplus for that year. This is, however, still

far from our imagined surplus of 30. Hungary in 1885 had a birth-rate of 44.8 and a death-rate of 31.9, leaving a surplus of 12.9. In 1906 Hungary's birth-rate had fallen to 36.0 and her death-rate to 24.8, leaving a difference of 11.2. The birth-rate in the Netherlands decreased between 1885 and 1906 from 34.4 to 30.4 and the death-rate decreased from 21.0 to 14.8. Suppose, now, that Hungary's birth-rate remained at the figure for 1885 and that at the same time she had been able to improve sanitary conditions to such a degree as to reduce her death-rate not simply to her own death-rate for 1906, but to that of Holland for that year. The result would be a surplus of births over deaths of 30 per thousand, a surplus well above the need for establishing Malthus's claim. There would seem, therefore, to be no good grounds for denying Malthus's contention that an *unchecked* population might easily double its numbers every twenty-five years. Of course, it is not necessary in establishing the tendency to a geometrical ratio of increase to show that it would if unchecked double itself every twenty-five years. Even if it doubles itself once every hundred years, as Germany has actually done, and as Great Britain has much more than done, the case is established for the abstract tendency to increase in geometrical progression.

While population tends to increase in a geometrical ratio, subsistence for man, says Malthus, increases in an arithmetical ratio. While population tends to double itself every twenty-five years, the slower increase in subsistence counteracts this tendency and keeps population from actually doubling itself every twenty-five years. Or to state the tendency in figures, in twenty-five-year periods the population if unchecked would increase in the ratio 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc. In the corresponding periods, subsistence for man can increase at most, according to Malthus, in the ratio 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. But since the 4, 8, 16, etc. of population cannot subsist on the 3, 4, 5, etc. of food, the increase of population is necessarily held back. Let us now examine the foundation for this arithmetical increase of subsistence.

While it is true that food for man often grows spontaneously and unaided by man, it seldom does so on a scale large enough to supply the needs of any considerable population. We need to

consider, therefore, only the manner in which food increases when encouraged by man's efforts. The labor power of population 1, we are told, can produce a food supply of 1; the labor power of population 2 can produce a food supply 2; but the labor power of population 4 can at most produce a food supply 3. That this principle is not universally true can be easily shown. Assuming that the third and fourth contingents of labor are as efficient workers as the first and second, and that as the labor power has been increased, the *area of cultivated land* has been increased in the same proportion, there is every reason to believe that when the population reaches 4, the subsistence will likewise reach 4, other things being equal. To this a Malthusian might reply that Malthus had in mind the case of England with its supply of land limited. This, however, was not Malthus's thought. He says in the first chapter that "there is still a great portion of uncultivated land" in England and Scotland, and he thinks of the increased population as applying its energies to the cultivation of an ever-increasing area of land. Granting the extension of the area cultivated, Malthus is not justified in asserting that "the most enthusiastic speculator cannot suppose a greater increase than that the produce of this island might be increased every twenty-five years by a quantity equal to what it at present produces," provided, for instance, that during the twenty-five years, there is *added* to the labor supply an amount of labor twice as great as that which produces the present produce of the island.

But even if we grant that the land of England is all occupied, and that the increased population must subsist from the area which formerly supplied the smaller population, it does not follow that an increase in population from 2 to 4 will be accompanied by an increase of food supply from 2 to 3 only. To make this clear it will be convenient at this point to consider the law of diminishing returns.

The law of diminishing returns has been stated in various ways, and much confusion has arisen over misunderstandings as to what it is meant to include. For our purpose it will be convenient to give to it the general meaning which it usually has in current economic literature, and to state it somewhat nar-

rowly. In the cultivation of a given area of ground, experience tells us, as we add to our labor expenditure, other things being equal, we finally reach a point beyond which, if we continue to add to the labor expenditure, the product of the land will not increase in proportion to the increase in the quantity of labor expended. If this were not true, in other words, if additional expenditures of labor on the same land always gave a return in product in proportion to the amount of labor expended, the human race would not need to spread out over the face of the earth. Sufficient food for the entire human race could be found in France or in England or in Ohio. But since the law of diminishing returns is true, it does not pay to work a part of the land too intensively while there is other good land which can be had conveniently and which is not worked at all or is only worked lightly. While this truth is recognized by nearly everyone who has given the matter any thought, it is impossible to say in the case of any given piece of land, because of certain varying factors, just exactly what is the rate at which the proportionality of return falls off as the labor expenditure is increased. By experiment, however, approximately correct results might be obtained. For our purpose we shall have figures sufficiently accurate if we borrow from Walker an illustration which he considers typical of the situation (and we here condense Walker's statement).

Suppose that ten laborers are engaged in cultivating in common a tract of land of a hundred acres, producing 2,000 bushels of wheat a year, being 20 bushels per acre and 200 bushels per capita. Now suppose that two laborers join themselves to the company. Will the crop be 2,400 bushels, or more, or less? The answer will depend upon whether the point of diminishing returns has been reached with the original ten laborers. If not the crop may be more than 2,400 bushels. But let us suppose that the point of diminishing returns has already been reached, and that the crop produced by the twelve laborers amounts to 2,280 bushels, each acre producing 22.8 bushels. Each man will then receive 190 bushels as his share. Now suppose that three additional laborers are added to the company. Will the new product be such as to give to each of the laborers 190 bush-

els as before? Not if the industrial character of the laborers and the knowledge of the art of agriculture undergo no change. If twelve laborers make the land yield but 22.8 bushels per acre, the fifteen cannot make the same amount of land yield 28.5 bushels per acre. The crop will be something less than that: say, 27 bushels per acre, which would give each man 180 bushels and which would make a total crop of 2,700 bushels. Again, suppose that five additional laborers join the company. The crop will not now be 36 bushels per acre as would be necessary, in order to give each man 180 bushels, which the first fifteen received. The crop could not be forced by the labor of twenty laborers above say, 32 bushels per acre, which would give each of the laborers 160 bushels and which would make a total product of 3,200 bushels. I have borrowed these figures from Walker in preference to making an assumption of my own because the figures were worked out as typical of actual conditions and without any thought of their being used in the refutation of the Malthusian parallel series. Nevertheless, they serve admirably to overturn the Malthusian arithmetical progression. In Walker's illustration, no account is taken of advantages of division of labor. We may, therefore, consider that two men on twenty acres of land of the assumed quality, would produce proportionately as much as ten men on a hundred acres. Two men working on twenty acres would produce twenty bushels per acre or a total of 400 bushels. Without going through the intermediate steps, we find that four men on twenty acres would produce proportionately as much as twenty men on a hundred acres. They would, therefore, produce 32 bushels per acre, or a total of 640 bushels, which would be 160 bushels per laborer. According to Malthus, as we increase the labor supply from two to four, we can at the very utmost, increase the food supply from 2 to 3. But according to Walker's assumption, which he considers typical and which undoubtedly is representative of actual conditions, we find that while we increase the labor supply from 2 to 4, we may, without any change in the art of agriculture, increase the product from 400 to 640. This is a greater increase than Malthus's parallel series would admit as possible. True, if we proceed far enough in applying additional labor to a definite

area of land, we shall reach a point, provided that we do not change our agricultural methods, where the increase in product will be necessarily less than Malthus's limit, but on the other hand, when cultivation is near the point of diminishing returns, the increase in product will be much more than the Malthusian formula will permit. Now, a general law which admits of as many exceptions as there are cases which follow the rule, is very much in need of re-statement.

There is therefore no ground for holding that with population increasing in geometrical progression, subsistence can increase only in arithmetical progression. There is no ground for holding this to be universally correct even where emigration and foreign trade and improved methods in production are not called into requisition. Where a population avails itself of any or all of these expedients, the diverging mathematical lines, as conceived by Malthus, are still farther from the truth.

The population of England and Wales increased in the nineteenth century from 9,250,000 to 32,527,000, and this increase took place in the presence of an increasing average standard of living. This would not have happened in the face of the law of diminishing returns, if the people had lived from the products of the same land cultivated in the same way in 1800 and in 1900. But England is a manufacturing country, and is, on this account, released, to a certain extent, from the rigors of the law of diminishing returns. Indeed, it is often said that the law of diminishing returns does not apply to manufacturers, but on the contrary, this branch of production is subject to a law of increasing returns. Perhaps a more accurate expression would be that manufactures are subject to a law of diminishing costs, due to large scale production. Where a nation lives by manufacturing it will often happen that the advantages which come to it from the development of its industries which accompanies its growth in population, will offset or more than offset the disadvantage which arises from the fact that its food supply which it acquires by exchange is produced under conditions of diminishing returns. To illustrate, let us assume a country with a laboring population of four millions. Suppose further that half of these are engaged in agriculture and half in manu-

facture. Let us represent the product in each case at 2. The population doubles in the course of time, and now we have four millions of agricultural workers and four millions engaged in manufacturing. If two millions of agricultural laborers produced a product represented by 2, four millions will not produce a product of 4, other things being equal, if the point of diminishing returns has been passed and the land supply has not been increased. Let us suppose that the four millions produce 3.2. At the same time the laborers engaged in industry have likewise increased from two millions to four millions, but owing to the advantages of large scale production which is pretty generally met with in manufacturing and commerce, their output more than doubles; it increases from 2 to something more than 4. Let us suppose that it increases from 2 to 5. The total product which was originally 2 plus 2, or 4, has now increased to 3.2 plus 5, or 8.2, while the laboring population has increased from four millions to eight millions. In other words, here is an improvement in standard of life accompanying an increasing population.

The strict Malthusian will object to the above demonstration that while an increased *pro rata* production of manufactured goods will usually follow increased applications of labor, yet this increased output is not available for subsistence. Men must have food and they must get the food from the land, no matter how skilful they may be in manufacturing articles of value. Therefore, says the Malthusian, agricultural production and manufacturing are two separate accounts which must be settled separately, and which cannot be balanced off against each other. In the case of a country without foreign trade, this would be true, except, of course, in so far as diminishing costs in manufacturing would leave free an ever-increasing percentage of the population to engage in agriculture. But where a country carries on foreign trade it can get from abroad an ever-increasing proportion of its food supply and pay for it with manufactured goods produced under more favorable conditions than those under which it could produce its own food supply at home. This process can go on as long as there are foreign lands so thinly settled and with industry so little advanced that they con-



sider this trade profitable. This amounts in effect to an increase of the home soil by the addition to it of the foreign.

In a similar way, the rigors of the Malthusian "principle" are mitigated by emigration. The population may increase rapidly and subsistence less rapidly, but the checks of misery and vice and moral restraint need not be called into play because the surplus population leaves the home country and finds a more generous soil abroad. Probably as many persons as there are in France today, emigrated from Europe during the nineteenth century. Such an exodus as this permits of a considerable increase of births over deaths before an increased pressure upon subsistence is felt. In the case of Ireland, more persons have emigrated from the island since 1845 than there are in it today.

In stating the law of diminishing returns above, the proviso was made, "other things being equal." One of these "other things" which were not to be changed is the art of agriculture. But as a matter of fact there are from time to time improvements in agricultural methods, and then "other things" are not equal. These improvements in the methods of agricultural production are sometimes the cause and sometimes the result of increases in the number of the people, but whether cause or effect, they may suspend temporarily some of the consequences of the law of diminishing returns. When a few hundred thousand Indians over-ran the present territory of the United States and lived for the most part from hunting and fishing, they doubtless considered that the land was none too extensive for their numbers. The situation among the Germans in Cæsar's time was somewhat of an improvement over this, for they lived principally from their herds and the land was able to carry a larger number to a given area, than was the case among the American Indians. It is unlikely that the Germans went over from a pastoral to an agricultural mode of life through an apriori speculation of the joys of farming. More probably their numbers increased to such an extent that they found it difficult to provide adequately for their needs by the old methods. Of course, there were other motives, too, but probably none more important than this. With the better provision against want which came with the cultivation of the soil, human life

was conserved and numbers grew. The methods of cultivation were at first rude and relatively unproductive, but as the population demanded ever more and more food, by slow and crude stages improvement was made until the three-field system was discovered, and later, crop rotation and artificial manuring, and improved machinery. With each improvement it was possible for a given area to carry a larger population, and with each great improvement, the larger population came partly as cause and partly as result of the increased food supply. It has been estimated that in Cæsar's time there were in Germany between five and six persons to the square kilometer; in the year 1300, seventeen to twenty; in 1700, twenty-six to twenty-eight; in 1800, forty to forty-five; and in 1895, ninety-two persons to the square kilometer.

The German population of today would be continually on the verge of starvation, if it were compelled to produce its living wholly on German soil with the German agricultural methods of 1300. There would be rank over-population. The same would be true if the population of 1300 had to make its living after the manner of the Germans of Cæsar's time. The question as to the existence of over-population cannot, therefore, be determined by dividing the number of the population by the number of square miles which they occupy. Over-population is relative to the state of the productive arts.

It would be painting entirely too beautiful a picture of the progress of the arts if we were to suppose, however, that as numbers have increased in the past, the corresponding food supply was always at hand for their support. The picture would be truer to life if we were to suppose that there has always been a section of the population who were in want of the necessaries of life. Godwin, in Malthus's day, and a great many optimists since that time have, indeed, held that where a section of the community have suffered for the very necessaries of life, it has been because of man's injustice in distributing wealth, and not because of the niggardliness of nature. There is a certain amount of truth in this contention, but it is true in much the same way as would be the statement that the Germans of 1300 suffered not because of the niggardliness of nature, but

because they had not adopted the more perfect methods of production of the twentieth century. As an increasing population demands a larger output of food, there will be a tendency to supply the demand at the point of least resistance. The point of least resistance may be in the field of technical improvements in machines or methods, or it may be in a fairer distribution of the existing product. In the latter case, the fairer distribution will relieve the distress and permit of raising the lower limits of the standard of life. Population will, if comparatively "unchecked," again sooner or later catch up with food supply, in the sense that a section of the people will feel that they are not as well off as they were formerly. As this feeling develops, renewed pressure will be put upon the intelligence of the community to devise new methods of production. Of course, it is not meant here to assert that methods of production are improved only in response to pressure of population. The generally rising standards of the last century prove the contrary.

As population increases, the principal means of escaping the unfortunate consequences of the agricultural law of diminishing returns, are as we have seen, emigration, development of industry and foreign commerce, and improvement in agricultural methods. Are there limits to these outlets of escape? Let us see. Emigration can continue with profit only until all of the foreign lands are as fully saturated with people as the lands from which the emigration comes. Likewise, when the point of saturation is reached, foreign commerce will no longer supply the home population with food. Various attempts have been made to estimate the amount of increase which can take place before such a condition of saturation is experienced. Some of the least optimistic of these estimates place the number of inhabitants which the earth will carry in the present state of the arts, at six thousand millions. Keeping in mind the fact that the population of the earth has increased from 150 millions to 1,500 millions in the last 1900 years, and that with a surplus rate of births over deaths as low as ten per thousand, the present 1,500 millions will become 6,000 millions in a period of 140 years, it will be realized that the problem is not necessarily out-

side the field of speculation. At this low rate of excess of births over deaths, the population will double itself every seventy years; so if we place the earth's saturation point at 12,000 millions or even 24,000 millions, we simply put the problem off another seventy or one hundred and forty years. The ultimate outlet for population, therefore, will be neither commerce nor emigration, but improved technical processes. Whether invention will always increase as rapidly as population, and thus obviate the necessity of a general lowering in standards of life, is a problem which lies so completely in the field of prophecy that a guess in one direction is about as valuable as a guess in the other. We shall be on more solid ground when we affirm that the probability is that judging from the past the stream of progress will not represent a uniform current, but that there will be rapids and eddies here and there, and that in the less inventive nations or in parts of nations, either population will crowd upon subsistence, producing relative over-population, or the issue will be met by placing checks upon increase in numbers.

And this leads us to say a word about checks. According to Malthus, the numbers of the people are kept within the limits of subsistence by means of three classes of checks,—misery, vice, and self-restraint. It has often been said and it is sometimes even said by Catholic economists that this teaching is immoral. This judgment of Malthus, however, is much too harsh. Malthus was a well-meaning clergyman and he did not wish vice to prevail. True, in his first edition, he considered it all but a necessary consequence of the principle of population; but later he sought to minimise it by preaching moral restraint. Certain later writers were made pessimistic as to the possibility of getting food on easy terms and openly advocated immoral practices. They called themselves neo-Malthusians and thus injured his good name.

The principal objection to Malthus's enumeration of checks is that he did not take sufficient account of other factors which restrict population. For instance, any custom which will raise the average age at which women marry, will tend to counteract the "principle of population." In as far as such putting off of marriage is caused by a fear of inability to procure subsistence,

it may fall under Malthus's heading of "moral restraint." But where it is not simply the result of prudence, but occurs because of the general desire of parents to keep their daughters with them as long as possible, or because the parents find it difficult to furnish a dowry, as custom in some places demands, there is a real check upon Malthus's geometrical series which does not come within his classification. Democracy, modern city life, and the feminist movement are forces in the same direction, and not adequately provided for by Malthus's three-fold classification. Other non-Malthusian checks might also be enumerated. True, all of these result to a greater or less degree in vice, but it is not necessarily vice which is here the check upon the geometrical increase in population.

In summing up our position on the Malthusian theory, we would say that Malthus was partly right and partly wrong with respect to his statement of tendencies, and he was more right a century ago than he would be today. The material progress of the last hundred years has taught us an optimism which laughs at the Malthusian forebodings. On the other hand, the general falling off in the birth-rate (which cannot be said to be a complete refutation of Malthusianism until we have better statistical information concerning the "checks") has caused people to lose interest in the bogey of over-population. The new competition for the earth by the different nations and races has raised for each people a fear of falling behind in the struggle through lack of numbers rather than a fear of hardship growing out of increased numbers. The prophecy of the present day with respect to numbers which seems most likely to be fulfilled is that the more fecund peoples and races will ultimately inherit the earth. This sobering reflection leads the social philosopher to stress lightly the remnant of truth residing in the Malthusian "principle of population."

FRANK O'HARA.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**Chronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam Ordinis Minorum** edidit  
Oswaldus Holder-Egger. Hannoverae et Lipsiae, impensis  
bibliophili Hahniani MDCCCXCV-MDCCCXXIII. (*Monu-  
menta Germaniae Historica . . . Scriptorum* tomus xxxii).  
Pp. xxxii + 755.

The development of the critical scientific spirit which has been such a marked feature in modern historical literature and research, has done much to facilitate the study of the sources from which we derive our knowledge of the Middle Ages. Many of the mediæval chronicles, that had hitherto only been accessible in scattered mss. or in a very defective printed form, have now been brought together, edited by experts and published in convenient and inexpensive collections. Foremost among these collections is the one known under the general title of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Although edited with special attention to Germany, this series forms by far the best of all the collections of sources for the student of the general history of Western Europe during the Middle Ages. The standard of excellence established by the preceding volumes is fully maintained in the volume before us which contains a critical edition of the famous Chronicle of Salimbene, a Franciscan friar who lived from 1221 to 1288 or about that year.

Up to a comparatively recent date this remarkable work has been practically inaccessible. True, an edition of Salimbene's Chronicle was printed at Parma in 1857, but this edition was made from a very imperfect transcript and it was not until the treasures of the Vatican Library were thrown open to students by Pope Leo XIII that the original ms. of the Chronicle was brought within easy reach and its publication made possible. Students of the history of the thirteenth century have long felt the need of an edition of Salimbene's work which would fulfil the requirements of modern criticism. The present one was, assuredly, worth waiting for. It would have been difficult, perhaps, to have found any one better fitted for the task of editing such a work than Prof.

Holder-Egger, for he is recognized as an authority on all that concerns mediæval chronicles, and it is only to be regretted that he did not live to complete the work. The first and second parts of the edition under review, published in 1905 and 1908 respectively, were edited by Prof. Holder-Egger, but the third part which was issued in 1913, was continued under the auspices of Bernard Schmeidler. Taken as a whole this new edition of Salimbene's Chronicle leaves nothing to be desired. It is a perfect monument of critical skill and pure erudition.

It is impossible to enter here into any detailed consideration of the contents of Salimbene's Chronicle. There is no question that it is one of the most intimate human documents of the thirteenth century. Indeed, it stands out like an illuminated initial in the dull gray text of some crabbed codex. For Salimbene is no ordinary chronicler. As is well known, mediæval chronicles deal for the most part with what are called great men and remarkable occurrences, and they leave us to read between the lines as best we can the details of daily life. Salimbene, on the contrary, is as careful to record the price at which a duck or a dozen of eggs could be bought in this or that place, as he is to set down the deeds of Kings, the decrees of Popes, the outcome of wars, councils and the like. He is in some sort a thirteenth century Pepys. Not only is his narrative intensely interesting, it is also profoundly personal. Salimbene not only witnessed a number of stirring religious and political events himself, but he met and knew many of the most important men of his time. The clearness and vividness of his opinions and descriptions of contemporary men and events, their minuteness as well as their wide range, go to make Salimbene's Chronicle of the utmost value. As a picture of the inner life of the wonderfully interesting period in which its author lived, it is altogether unique.

Take, for example, this account of a banquet given by St. Lewis, King of France, at which Salimbene was present. "*Habuimus igitur illa die primo cerasas, postea panem albiſſimum: vinum quoque ut magnificentia regia dignum erat, abundans et precipuum ponebatur . . . Postea habuimus fabas recentes cum lacte decoctas, pisces et caneros pastillos anguillarum, risum cum lacte amigdalarum et pulvere cynamoni, anguillas assatas cum optimo salsamento, turtas et juncatas et fructus necessarios habuimus abun-*

danter atque decenter. Et omnia curialiter fuerunt apposita et sedit ministrata" (pp. 224-25). Of the holy King himself Salimbene gives us this pleasing picture: "Erat autem rex subtilis et gracilis, macilentus convenienter et longus, habens vultum angelicum et faciem gratiosam. Et veniebat . . . non in pompa regali, sed in habitu peregrini, habens capsellam et burdonem peregrinationis ad collum, qui optime scapulas regias decorabat" (p. 222). And here is his description of Frederic II: "Nota quod Fridericus quasi semper dilexit habere discordiam cum ecclesia et eam multipliciter impugnavit, que nutrierat eum, defenderat et exaltaverat. De fide Dei nichil habebat. Callidus homo fuit, versutus, avarus, luxuriosus, malitiosus, iracundus. Et valens homo fuit interdum, quando voluit bonitates et curialitates suas ostendere, solatiosus, jocundus, delitiosus, industrius; legere, scribere et cantare sciebat et cantilena et cantiones invenire; pulcher homo et bene formatus, sed medie stature fuit. Vidi enim eum et aliquando dilexi . . . et ut breviter me expediam, si bene fuisset catholicus et dilexisset Deum et ecclesiam et animam suam, paucos habuisset in imperio pares in mundo" (p. 348).

Unfortunately, the vigor of Salimbene oozes sadly away in any translation. Portions, indeed, of his Chronicle are of such a character that they can hardly be rendered in our more fastidious language. Yet, strange as it may seem, this autobiography of the Parmesan friar was written for the special reading of his niece, who was a Poor Clare, and we may be sure, for the rest, our author never dreamt that posterity would treasure it up as one of the curiosities of mediæval literature.

It seems desirable in connection with this new edition of Salimbene to add a word concerning a volume lately published in London entitled, "From St. Francis to Dante: A translation of all that is of primary interest in the Chronicle of the Franciscan Salimbene," etc., by G. G. Coulton, M.A. (2nd edition, revised and enlarged. London: Dockworth and Co., pp. xiv + 446). This work is based upon the critical edition issued in the *Monumenta* but does not, of course, pretend to be a complete translation of Salimbene's Chronicle. But it contains more of the Chronicle than has hitherto appeared in print in English. A comparison of the selections Mr. Coulton has translated with the Latin text will show how faithful has been his rendering of them. One



wishes, however, that Mr. Coulton had allowed these selections from Salimbene to stand by themselves with none but needful explanatory notes. As it is, Mr. Coulton has done much more than merely translate Salimbene. His translation is interwoven with a kind of running commentary of his own which it is not always easy to disengage from Salimbene's narrative. What is here more trying is the aggressively controversial tone which characterizes Mr. Coulton's volume throughout. Salimbene was, no doubt, very impulsive, rather greatly influenced and somewhat inclined to be a partisan, but he was certainly neither a theorist nor a crotchety-monger. In order, then, to understand and appreciate his account of mediæval life and manners, he should be allowed to tell it in his own way. This is just what Mr. Coulton is reluctant, apparently, to let Salimbene do. He has been at pains to make our Chronicle and the other contemporary sources which he uses to "illustrate" it, serve the purpose of bringing out the darkest side of mediæval life both in the cloister and the world. We are given, in consequence, a picture which is so one-sided that it might easily mislead a certain class of readers. So true is this that those who know nothing of Salimbene and his time would undoubtedly form a wrong estimate of both if they stayed their studies at Mr. Coulton's volume. By no means is it suggested that Mr. Coulton is ever intentionally prejudiced or unfair. It is, however, a matter of regret that he should have fallen such an easy captive to a thesis and that he, therefore, fails to do full justice to his subject. This is all the more to be regretted inasmuch as Mr. Coulton is such a learned mediæval scholar and so specially qualified to throw light on every part of the period covered by Salimbene's Chronicle.

So much by way of criticism of Mr. Coulton's work. All the rest must be praise. There is scarcely a dull passage in the nearly five hundred pages of "From St. Francis to Dante." The reader who is sufficiently familiar with the original text of Salimbene to discount the bias which tends to mar some portions, at least, of Mr. Coulton's commentary, will find his volume most thoughtful, suggestive and illuminating. Where Mr. Coulton has done a real service is in pointing out the limitations of some current interpretations of the thirteenth century which conceive the story of that wonderful century to have been, as it were, all stained-glass and liturgy, knight-errantry and pageantry. As a wholesome cor-

rective to any such unhistorical glorification of the period that extends from St. Francis to Dante, a careful perusal of the Chronicle of Salimbene is much to be recommended.

---

**Life and Characteristics of the Right Reverend Alfred A. Curtis, D. D., second bishop of Wilmington, Delaware.** Compiled by the Sisters of the Visitation, Wilmington, Delaware. With a Preface by Cardinal Gibbons. P. J. Kennedy & Sons. New York, 1913. 8°. Pp. xiv + 446.

Notwithstanding the fact that Bishop Curtis desired before his death that none of his writings, and least of all his correspondence should survive him, a sufficiently large collection of scattered notes and letters has been brought together in this volume to give it the intimate, personal quality which good biography demands. Though the harvest is not superabundant, it is well distributed over many years, and consequently, it is easy, by means of those documents, to follow the various stages in the bishop's intellectual and spiritual activities from the time of his conversion, up to his death in 1908. From these written memorials and from the sympathetic account of his manifold activities as priest and bishop, the career of Bishop Curtis is revealed as that of a strong, independent, forceful and earnest man in whom there could be no compromise between conviction and conduct. He was born in Somerset County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and though his conversion to the Catholic Church severed many of the closest ties of his early life, he never ceased to be devotedly attached to the place of his birth and his early associations. The combination of Catholicity and sturdy unaffected manliness which he brought to his new faith made of him a singularly lovable and ardent pastor of souls. The career of Bishop Curtis contained nothing that was extraordinary or striking except his punctilious performance of what he conceived to be his duty, and his remarkable love and zeal in the service of God. Tirelessly and constantly he worked as missionary and pastor, and his work bore fruit under his eyes. The preparation of the biography of Bishop Curtis could not have fallen into better hands than those of the Visitation nuns in Wilmington, whose spiritual director he was for many years, and in

whose convent enclosure he found his last resting place. They are to be congratulated on having written a biographical sketch which is free from exaggeration and marked by simplicity and restraint. The second portion of this book which contains a series of notes, spiritual counsels, sermons, outlines for the exercises of retreats and extracts made by the bishop from the writings of the Fathers, are valuable as showing though imperfectly, his mind and purposes. For priests who are engaged in labors similar to those which occupied Bishop Curtis the book cannot fail to be an inspiration and a guide.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**L'Ascetisme chrétien pendant les trois premiers siècles de l'Église.** Par F. Martinez, S. M. Docteur en Théologie. Paris. Gabriel Beauchesne, 1913. 8°. Pp. ix + 208.

A twofold purpose is achieved in this excellent monograph: Ante-Nicene ascetical practices are excellently delineated, and the link between the teaching of Our Lord and the rise of monasticism is clearly established. Protestant writers are frank in stating that on few points are they so much at variance with Catholics as on the subject of asceticism. Hence since the sixteenth century a flood of different theories has been loosed to explain the origin of monasticism as something alien to the teaching of Our Lord and foreign to the Gospel. Inasmuch as monasticism did not make its appearance until the fourth century, it has been denounced as an importation from non-Christian sources as something derived either from Judaism or paganism. The purpose of Protestant critics has been to point out similarities between Christian and Pagan ascetical practices and on this unsubstantial and insufficient basis to argue to a community of origin. The purpose of the present author is to show that, even admitting that such resemblances do exist, they are to be traced to the common modes through which the religious instincts of humanity find expression. He contents himself with arguing that ascetical practices are inseparable from religious earnestness; he might have gone further and asserted with Professor William James that ascetical practices are inseparable from serious effort at perfection in any field of endeavor, and that with

the comparatively limited range of human activity, these efforts even without a religious basis assume similar features. The peculiarity which attaches to Christian ascetical endeavor cannot by any means find its explanation in derivation from anterior phenomena of a similar character; but is intelligible only in view of the special purposes and the unique character of the Christian scheme of life and destiny.

The Protestant propaganda has been directed against monastic institutions in particular, as being unchristian in source and character, and hence the present work is directed against the weakest point in such a position, for, by establishing the existence of ascetical practices in the three first centuries, the link is shown which connects monasticism with the ascetical prescriptions of Our Lord and the Apostles. The author might have been less modest in considering that his work does not sufficiently explain how the Christian ascetics were led to the practice of the eremitical life; for the career of the solitary and the hermit was only one degree removed from that of the strict ascetic living in society, and any one of a hundred external circumstances will sufficiently explain this later development without recourse to a new and specifically distinct interior motive or impulse. In a general way this work covers the same ground as that of Schiewitz, but with more point and directness. Step by step from the words and teaching of Our Lord, the author traces the presence of ascetical prescription in the writings of the early Christian authors and of ascetical practice in the lives of the faithful down to the end of the third century. With the wealth of material at his disposal such a task was not difficult; but the author is to be congratulated for the manner in which he has set forth the fact that asceticism was not only common in the early church, but that it was approved and fostered by ecclesiastical authority. No one can doubt the timeliness of such a study, and it is to be hoped that the conclusions of the author will not escape the notice of some recent writers on the subject of early monasticism, notably Allen and Workman. Har-nack, whom these authors follow, tacitly admits the evangelical basis for monasticism, when he argues that its earliest votaries sought for evangelical perfection by cutting themselves off from the secularized Church! When it is clearly demonstrated that ascetical practices prevailed at all times in the early Church, it

is not difficult to establish the relationship between asceticism and monasticism, for the latter is merely asceticism in a corporate form and the monastic rule merely a definite norm of ascetical observance. Western Christendom has always looked on St. Anthony as the Father of the eremitical life. The place of Pachomius and Shenoudi and Basil as monastic organizers is just as clearly established. The monastic institute once founded spread rapidly: but its claims were not blindly accepted, and later monastic legislators, such as Basil and Benedict, did not feel bound to commit themselves until they had studied its claims, and established to their own satisfaction its practical if not theoretical pre-eminence over the anchorite state.

It is not possible here to refer to the many interesting matters of detail with which this author deals in different parts of his work: but it is to be hoped, that the excellence of this study and its clearly demonstrated conclusions, will convince Protestant critics of monasticism that the Rule was the natural and logical sequel and outcome of three centuries of ascetical activity.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**Regesto dell' antica Badia di S. Matteo de Castello o Servorum Dei.** Pubblicato a cura dei Monaci di Montecassino. Badia di Montecassino, 1914. 8°. Pp. + 192.

The monastery of S. Matteo de Castello was situated a short distance from the more famous and more influential Monastery of Monte Cassino. Its history was closely bound up with the latter and it ended by having its estates turned over to the *mensa Abbatis* of Monte Cassino in the fifteenth century. The Regesta of the monastery which are here published contain principally documents dealing with gifts of lands or tenements to the monastery or deeds of sale. Very few refer to other subjects. There are in all seventy-five of these documents, sixty-five of which are taken from the Regesta of the monastery itself now preserved in manuscript at Monte Cassino, ten, added as an appendix, are derived from other sources. A short and interesting account of the monastery is found in the Introduction, together with a description of the mss. and some paleographical notes. Photo-

graphic reproductions of some typical pages of the mss., and a picture of the present condition of the ruins of the monastery are found at the end of the work. The dates of the documents range from 1038 to 1457, and taken all together they offer an interesting sidelight on the economic life of a mediæval Italian abbey.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**American Catholic Hymnal.** By the Marist Brothers. P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 44 Barclay St. New York, 1914. 8vo. 512 pages. Price, \$1.50; postpaid \$1.68.

The full title of this book is as follows: "An Extensive Collection of Hymns, Latin Chants and Sacred Songs for Church, School and Home: Including Gregorian Masses, Vesper Psalms, Litanies, Motets for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, etc.: According to the *Motu Proprio* of His Holiness Pope Pius X.: Written, arranged and compiled especially for the Catholic Youth of the United States." The description is faithfully expressive of the contents.

The item "Including Gregorian Masses, etc." does not mean that any excessive development was given to the strictly liturgical part: for, out of 444 entries, 318 are in English.

In numberless parishes, the Hymnal Book represents and supplies a great part, sometimes almost the totality, of educational materials along the lines of sacred music. Moreover, the recent reform of liturgical music has forced its beneficial influences even on extra-liturgical matters like the singing in the vernacular, and to such an extent that the public of today disapproves of many a hymnal of former times and calls for radical improvements. Besides, there is a modern tendency to supplement Hymn Books with collections of easy and popular pieces of plain chant, and to associate such books with the movement of Gregorian restoration: a very laudable tendency.

Now, as an educational, and progressive, and Gregorian collection of songs, the American Catholic Hymnal is a very remarkable one.

But it is useless to praise it, as in such matters musical directors have to judge for themselves. When they know that such a book

has come out, and where it is to be found, they get a copy of it, and read it, and act according to their personal estimate.

Let them do so for the American Catholic Hymnal of the Marist Brothers.

ABEL L. GABERT.

---

**Early Latin Hymnaries.** An Index of hymns in hymnaries before 1100. With an Appendix from later sources. By James Mearns, M. A. Cambridge University Press, 1913. Pp. xx + 107.

The Index here printed was meant to be part of a volume on Hymns in a series of manuals of liturgical study but, when completed, it proved to be so bulky, that it was found necessary to publish it as a separate work. In its present form the Index provides a convenient handbook of reference for those interested in early Latin hymns and it gives a representative list of the Latin hymns actually in use throughout Europe before the year 1100. In order to show the continuity in the use of certain hymns during the mediæval period, some hymnaries of the twelfth century, with a few of a still later date, have been indexed by the author, who notes that many of these manuscripts have the ancient melody set to the hymns. The hundred and twenty-three hymns indexed in the volume before us are arranged in classes, according as they were written in England, France, Germany, Italy or Spain. Some verses of the hymn *Ter hora trina volvitur*, from a ms. written at S. Maximin, Trier, about 890, are reproduced as a frontispiece. Every student of early Latin hymnology must be grateful to the author for the labor and care that have gone to the making of this volume, which is a most important addition to the literature of the subject. The book itself is produced in that admirable fashion which we are accustomed to associate with everything coming from the Cambridge University Press.

---

**S. Francis of Assisi: A Play in Five Acts.** By M. Peladan.  
Translated by Harold John Massingham. New York, Scrib-  
ners, 1913.

Granted the need of an English version of M. Peladan's drama, the present rendering of it leaves little to be desired from a literary point of view. Only one wonders why Mr. Massingham ever chose Elizabethan English for his translation, or rather adaptation, of the present play, more especially as there is so wide a difference between M. Peladan's French and the Elizabethan diction used in the version before us. As regards the play itself, it may be enough to say here that it is based on St. Clare's love for St. Francis and that, as a consequence, it places both Saints, along with their companions, in a position for which there is not the slightest warrant in history. It is, indeed, an extraordinary atmosphere to which we are transported. No doubt a dramatist who creates his characters is at liberty to create their positions also. But it is surely obvious that one who professes to deal with historic personages enjoys no such latitude. If a playwright attempts by dramatic license any romance of position in portraying historic personages, he is clearly bound to invent such positions only as shall square with the characters of these personages as they are already fixed in the pages of history. Against this elementary precept M. Peladan's play offends repeatedly. The last act, in particular, in so far as it introduces a Dominican friar to disturb St. Francis on his deathbed, is a gross travesty.



## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### **Unveiling of Bust of Cardinal Gibbons at The Catholic University of America.**

At three o'clock Wednesday afternoon, April 22d, took place the unveiling of the bust of His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor of the Catholic University of America, presented to the Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Hall by Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore, Treasurer of the University. The presentation discourse was made by the Very Rev. P. C. Gavan, Pastor of the Sacred Heart Church, this city, for many years the Chancellor of Cardinal Gibbons. The bust was accepted in the name of the University by the Most Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis. Cardinal Gibbons was present on the occasion and surrounded by the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University, by its professors and students and the Heads of eight religious houses in the vicinity.

The bronze bust of the Cardinal is slightly over life size. The pedestal is of rosate marble and upon it is the coat of arms of the Cardinal, likewise in bronze. The bust is the work of J. Maxwell Miller, a distinguished sculptor of Baltimore, also a native and prize student of that city. Mr. Miller likewise executed the very handsome medallion, which was struck on the occasion of his double jubilee, and thought by many to be the most perfect bronze medallion ever executed in the United States.

The bust stands in the center of the beautiful Reception Lobby of the Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Hall. Around the Hall are cut in 16 large open panels as many beautiful bronze shields, upon which are inscribed, in Gothic lettering of red and black, the names of 113 principal benefactors of the Hall, persons who gave \$500 or more towards its erection.

The event was an unusually historic and animated one, and marks the completion of the beautiful Memorial Hall, begun three years ago in honor of the double jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons, and recently completed at a total expense of \$260,000. This large fund was entirely contributed by personal friends and admirers of the great patriotic Churchman, so that the noble edifice stands to-day

free of debt. It has rooms for 130 students, besides several large apartments, and a number of halls for social and administrative purposes.

DISCOURSE OF REV. P. C. GAVAN.

Your Eminence, Most Reverend and Right Reverend Fathers, and Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees:—

It is with feelings of the keenest pleasure and with a deep sense of the honor conferred upon me that I make the formal presentation to you of the Bust of the Most Eminent Chancellor of this University. I need hardly say, however, that I am presenting it, not in my own, but in the name of one whose unaffected simplicity of character makes him shrink from all public demonstrations whatsoever, especially those in which he is himself personally concerned,—I speak, of course, of Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore. And while Mr. Jenkins' interest in the University in general has never flagged from the beginning, he has conceived a pronounced attachment to this magnificent Memorial Hall in particular, on account of his profound esteem and affectionate reverence for the distinguished prelate in whose honor it has been erected.

In presenting his gift, the esteemed donor has been influenced by two predominant motives. The first is to stamp the name of Cardinal Gibbons so clearly and unequivocally on this Hall that all who enter its portals may know at once its meaning, and desire to learn its history; to instill the breath of life into the dead stones by placing in the very centre and heart of the building a life-like and speaking portrait of the man who has in such large measure been the very life and eloquent voice of the University from its birth; and finally to enshrine, if I may say so, a jewel of the plastic art in the beautiful architectural setting so richly and admirably prepared to receive it. And this representation in bronze of the Cardinal is indeed a work of fine art, of consummate skill, and exquisite workmanship. It is a consoling proof too that the divinity which rules over the domain of sculpture does not always limit her favors to any one country or fixed period of time, but will condescend on occasion, as in this instance, to guide the fingers and illumine the brain of earnest and inspiring American youth.

The second motive of the donor takes a loftier flight. It is to keep ever before the eyes of the students of future generations,

both ecclesiastical and lay, whose numbers, we can now safely predict, will be legion upon legion, a worthy and lasting reminder of the first Chancellor of this great University, its devoted protector, its one time savior, its constant and generous friend;—a lasting and eloquent reminder also of the eminent Churchman whose life and works have shed so much glory on the Catholic Church and the Catholic name in the United States.

May this noble Bust then tell to all who behold it the splendid story of the long and brilliant life which was ever consecrated first, last, and all the time to the highest possible ideals in religion, in true patriotism, and in Christian education, and may the knowledge thus acquired be an inspiration to them towards the highest spiritual and intellectual endeavor and achievement.

For the lives of great men all remind us  
We can make our lives sublime.

#### **The Judge John M. Mitchell Memorial Law Library.**

The Trustees of the Catholic University of America at their stated meeting on Wednesday, April 22, 1914, by vote established **THE JUDGE JOHN M. MITCHELL MEMORIAL LAW LIBRARY**. This action was made possible through the generosity of Misses Agnes and Marion L. Mitchell of Concord, New Hampshire, who wishing to perpetuate their father's memory, made their gift on the following conditions:—

“I. The Law Library of our deceased father shall be installed permanently in the School of Law of the Catholic University of America, and it shall be designated and known always as:

The Judge John M. Mitchell Memorial Law Library.”

“The Law Library of our deceased father shall be kept intact always in the School of Law of the Catholic University of America for reference use only, and no book in it shall be taken from the School of Law of the Catholic University of America for circulation purposes.”

“III. The Catholic University shall erect in its School of Law a fitting tablet commemorating the life of our deceased father, and shall place above the books, that he prized so highly, a picture of him, which we will donate.”

“IV. Our father's name, Judge John M. Mitchell, and our

deceased mother's name, Mrs. Julia C. Mitchell, shall be placed on the roll of the "Deceased Benefactors" of the Catholic University of America."

"V. Our names, Agnes Mitchell and Marion L. Mitchell, shall be placed now on the roll of the "Living Benefactors," and at our deaths shall be transferred to the roll of the "Deceased Benefactors" of the Catholic University of America."

"VI. The Trustees of the Catholic University of America at their stated meeting on Wednesday, April 22, 1914, shall by vote accept our gift on the conditions, that we have here mentioned."

Judge John M. Mitchell was born at Plymouth, July 6, 1849, the oldest child of John and Honora (Doherty) Mitchell, who came to this country from Ireland in 1848. When John M. Mitchell was born his father was employed in the work of building the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad, but soon after he engaged in farming, and Judge Mitchell's boyhood days were spent upon a Vermont farm, much of the time in Salem now a part of Derby. He attended the District School and at the age of fifteen entered Derby Academy. His course there was interrupted now and then for the purpose of teaching, his first position being in the town of Holland when he was sixteen years of age. He taught for six consecutive winters, and at the age of nineteen became Superintendent of Schools of the town of Salem, remaining there two years.

He began the study of law with Edwards and Dickerman at Derby, but in 1870 entered the office of Harry and George A. Bingham of Littleton. He was admitted to the bar in 1872, and was at once taken into partnership with Harry Bingham, which continued until the death of the latter in 1900. In 1881 a branch office was opened at Concord, and Judge Mitchell went there to reside. Before moving from Littleton he had served the town during two terms at Selectman, and the County as Solicitor from 1879 until his removal to Concord.

In Concord he served in the Legislature at the session of 1893 and in the Constitutional Conventions of 1902 and 1912 from ward 4, although it was a strong Republican ward and he was a steadfast member of the Democratic party. At the last convention he was the Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Judicial

Department. He was also the minority party member of the Railroad Commission from 1888 to 1891, when he resigned. He served as a member of the Democratic State Committee of New Hampshire for many years and was Chairman of the Democratic State Convention of 1888. In 1903, he was Democratic nominee for the United States Senate. He was for nine years a member of the Concord Board of Education, serving as the chairman, but declined further renomination. He was for many years a trustee of the New Hampshire State Hospital, and a trustee of the Margaret Pillsbury Hospital of Concord.

In a professional way he was prominent, having been identified with the most momentous railroad litigation that concerned the Courts of New Hampshire for a third of a century. His firm was leading counsel against the leasing of railroads from 1878 to 1884; for the Concord road from 1884 to 1888; for the Concord and Montreal, successors to the Concord, from 1891 to 1895, and for the Boston and Maine, successor to the Concord and Montreal, as its chief counsel in New Hampshire from 1907 till his appointment to the Bench in 1910. His practice was as broad as the civil docket, and in such cases he frequently appeared before the Court in every County in the State of New Hampshire, and before legislative committees in great number. He was entrusted with much probate business, having administered many large estates, and at the time of his death was still trustee of several.

He was the advisor of the Bishop of Portland (Me.) in all civil matters in New Hampshire for years before the creation of the Diocese of Manchester (N. H.) in 1883. Subsequently, the late, lamented Bishop John B. Delaney gave him unfaltering trust, and he had the confidence of Rt. Rev. George A. Guertin, D. D., the present Bishop of Manchester.

He was appointed a Judge of the Superior Court of New Hampshire by Gov. Henry B. Quincy on September 7, 1910, and was most active in the work of his position till his death on March 4, 1913. John H. Riedell, Law Reporter of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire has given the following estimate of Judge Mitchell:

"John M. Mitchell was successful as a lawyer because of his ability and industry, his unquestioned integrity, his unswerving loyalty, and his absolute honesty and fairness in dealing with

fellow members of the bar; and the qualities which brought him success as a practitioner made him an able, useful and universally respected judge. I knew him well for more than thirty years, and I believe the world is better for his having lived in it."

On November 19, 1874, he was married to Miss Julia C. Longergan, whose death antedated his by nine weeks. Two daughters, the donors of his Memorial, survive. Those who knew him best, say that his home life was ideal.

Judge John M. Mitchell was the first Catholic elevated to the Bench of the Superior Court of New Hampshire, and his career was an apt illustration of the success of the practical Catholic in an erstwhile unsympathetic environment. His life will serve as an inspiration to present and future students in the Law School of the Catholic University of America.

THOMAS C. CARRIGAN.

#### **Basselin College: A New University Foundation for Ecclesiastics.**

By the will of Theodore B. Basselin, of Croghan, N. Y., who died there April 19, 1914, the University will receive the residue of his estate, amounting to five hundred thousand dollars or more, for the purpose of providing a college for youthful aspirants to the priesthood, to be known as BASSELIN COLLEGE.

Of this sum one hundred thousand dollars may be expended for a building to be known as Basselin Hall.

The students of this College will be taken regularly from Catholic colleges, and will spend at the foundation the senior college year and two years devoted to the study of philosophy and the elements of certain ecclesiastical sciences. During these three years they are to receive, moreover, a special and regular training by good masters in all the arts and graces of ecclesiastical speaking and singing, so that they may enter the theological seminary well prepared for their formation as preachers of the Word of God.

The generous founder of this new college was particularly anxious that only the brightest and most promising young men should be taken, and that during the three years of their preliminary ecclesiastical formation, they should be drilled and trained with great care to the free and perfect use of the voice in reading the

Gospel and Epistle, in making the parochial announcements and communications, in the singing of the Holy Mass and all other services, in pulpit discourses and the conduct of societies. He was desirous that the Word of God should be announced in the churches with all the dignity that becomes its divine character and its absolute necessity.

Deeply religious by nature and life, he loved the Catholic Church profoundly and was persuaded that he could not better employ his large fortune than in making a perpetual provision for the best possible training of the young levites in one of their most essential duties.

The Catholic University of America will cherish the memory of Theodore Basselin as one of its principal benefactors. The noble foundation that he has created is unique in the history of ecclesiastical education, and cannot fail in time to influence favorably the regular training of ecclesiastics in all our seminaries.

Possibilities also of healthy growth on the part of such a solid foundation naturally suggest themselves, and there are good reasons for hoping that in connection with this foundation, ecclesiastical studies at the University may take on, in the more or less near future, that development which befits the present conditions and needs of the American Catholic Clergy.

We earnestly beg all the priestly graduates of the University to remember frequently at the Altar this generous and high-minded benefactor of the ecclesiastical order, likewise in all their prayers and good works, that he may soon enjoy the vision of the Glorious Redeemer whom he so loved on earth and whose Holy Church he served with such efficient and enduring love.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Meeting of the Trustees.** The meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University took place on Wednesday morning, April 22nd, at 10 o'clock, and those attending were: His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, Most Rev. Sebastian G. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee; Most Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis; Most Rev. James H. Blenk, Archbishop of New Orleans; Most Rev. Edmond F. Prendergast, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Most Rev. J. J. Keane, Archbishop of Dubuque; Right Rev. Camillus P. Maes, Bishop of Covington; Right Rev. John S. Foley, Bishop of Detroit; Right Rev. Thos. J. Shahan, Rector of the University; Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore, Md.; The Honorable Thomas Kerns, and Mr. Walter George Smith, of Philadelphia.

Many important matters were discussed, and the budget for the coming year was made up.

The Board decided to build at once a new Chemical Laboratory, at a cost of \$150,000, and which will be 280 feet long by 50 feet broad, and three stories in height. This laboratory will be ready, in part at least, for the opening of the scholastic year, and will be fitted up with everything necessary for the best undergraduate work in chemistry, and particularly for research work of the highest kind. Ample provisions are made for every demand of chemical science, and in the construction of the new building the best experience of the latest high grade research laboratories will be utilized. The construction of the building and its equipment will be under the personal supervision of Very Reverend John J. Griffin, Professor of Chemistry at the Catholic University.

The Trustees unanimously expressed themselves as very highly satisfied with the rapid and solid progress of the University, both in the number of students and the quality and efficiency of the new buildings.

---



**Shahan Debating Society.** The Third Annual Prize Debate of the Shahan Society was held in McMahon Hall on the evening of April 27. The Question was: "*Resolved: That the best interests of Society are served by a system of public pensions to needy widows with young children.*" On the Affirmative side were Messrs. John M. Russell, William F. Cronin, and Joseph F. Gunster; on the Negative, Messrs. Patrick L. Kirby, John J. Burke and Denis M. McDonough. The Judges, Hon. Henry F. Ashurst, U. S. Senator from Arizona, Hon. Thomas J. Walsh, U. S. Senator from Montana, and Very Rev. Dr. Pace, decided in favor of the Negative.

---

**Lecture on Sociology.** On Wednesday, April 22, Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, Head of the School of Political Science of Columbia University, lectured in McMahon Hall on "The New Profession of Social Service."

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*June, 1914.*

*No. 6.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

**J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*June, 1914.*

*No. 6.*

## HOW THE THREE THOUSAND WERE CONVERTED—II.

In a previous article <sup>1</sup> wherein was established the conclusion that the Conversion of the first Christians on Pentecost Sunday was due, not to blind enthusiasm, but to intellectual conviction begotten of reasonable evidence, and hence productive of rational faith, we promised in a further contribution to address ourselves to the supplementary question: At the inauguration of the New Dispensation what more than rational faith was deemed necessary to constitute one a true and full-fledged Christian? That promise we shall now endeavor to redeem. Our prime source of evidence shall be the same second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles—that brief narrative concerning the Pentecost group of converts—while not ignoring the other New Testament sources which cast light on the full import of the pregnant teaching compassed within such narrow limits. Comprised in the short space of ten verses, ranging from verse 37 to the close of the chapter, we get a picture of the inauguration, constitution, and condition of life of the earliest Christian community, which was the nucleus whose marvelous evolution and development—doctrinal, ethical, ritualistic, and disciplinary—has produced the wonderful organization called the Catholic Church. For we contend that the principles of Catholicism, and not those of Protestantism, and much less of Liberalism, are recognisable in and recommended by what we behold in the

<sup>1</sup> *O. U. B.*, Oct., 1913.

cradle of Christianity at Jerusalem. An analysis of the passage under consideration will make manifest our contention. We had better bring before the reader the verses which serve as the basis of our comments. Aroused by the discourse of St. Peter, the listeners seized with compunction of heart, inquire of "Peter and the rest of the Apostles: what shall we do, men and brethren? But Peter said to them do penance and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins: and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are far off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call. And with very many other words did he testify and exhort them, saying: Save yourselves from this perverse generation. They therefore that received his word were baptized: and there were added in that day about three thousand souls. And they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers. . . . And all they that believed were together and had all things in common. . . . And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved."<sup>2</sup>

Here we find a picture of a Christian community conducting a social religious life under the conduct of the Apostles, by whose doctrine it was enlightened, by whose counsel it was directed and in whose liturgy it participated. Men were initiated into and became members of this community by the right of baptism to which they were admitted only on the presence of certain dispositions, namely, faith and repentance. The significant import of these conditions and rites and mode of social and religious life we propose to develop in the following pages. Why was repentance demanded as a predisposition to admission into the Christian fold? What faith was insisted on as a prerequisite to baptism? What was the import of baptism itself? And what part did it play in the formation of Christianity? In fine, what resemblance does the religious life of the early Christians bear to the Christian life of later centuries? Have we not, in the primordial Christianity, those essential principles

<sup>2</sup> *Acts* II, 38-47.

of the Church which logically produced those dogmas and moral precepts, that ritual and discipline to which human pride in its various forms of revolt, whether in Modernism and Protestantism or Rationalism and Unbelief, offers such strenuous opposition, while in its folly appealing for support to the "simple Christianity" of the New Testament? Let us examine in detail those various elements that constitute the Christian life of the Pentecostal Community.

### *Penance*

Penance was insisted on because the convert should qualify to enter the Messianic Kingdom which was inaugurated by Christ after His baptism by John. This Kingdom, whose ethical code was made clear by the Sermon on the Mount and whose mysteries were revealed by the Parables of the Gospel, was the spiritual reign of God in the hearts of men, and had for direct object the overthrow of the domination of Satan, who ruled the world by sin. "For," in the words of a distinguished author, "Jesus Christ knew only one hostile power—evil and sin, which for Him, as for His contemporaries, was personified by Satan. Satan was His one foe, the one whom it was His mission to destroy. His Kingdom, therefore, was of a religious and moral order."<sup>3</sup> War must be waged on sin, and sin could be blotted out only by repentance, as we are taught by the whole of revelation whose doctrine is summed up in the words of the Council of Trent: "*Lapsos post baptismum posse rursus justificari, sed solum si veram poenitentiam egerint, quae ad remissionem peccatorum propriorum semper sit necessaria.*"<sup>4</sup> Hence the meaning of the oft-repeated proclamation<sup>5</sup>: "Do penance, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," and the mission of the Apostles, "to preach penance and remission of sins" in the name of Christ.<sup>6</sup> How Peter and the other Apostles complied with their commission we gather from the words:

<sup>3</sup> *Studies on the Gospels*, p. 105, V. Rose.

<sup>4</sup> *Sess.* 14, c. 1, 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Matt.* III, 1, IV, 17, x, 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Luc.* XXIV. 47.

"Be penitent therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." <sup>7</sup> Throughout the entire book of the Acts we observe how this change of heart was ever insisted on as the disposition essential to the reception of the new life of grace infused into the soul through faith and baptism.

### *Faith*

But penance, while the first and important step towards obtaining forgiveness of sin, was not sufficient for justification. Faith was equally necessary. Two interesting questions straightway arise: what faith was necessary? and what is the minimum one must believe in order that he may be justified and saved? In the event under consideration and on many similar occasions described for us in the Acts we find that the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ—as manifested by His miracles, His Resurrection and Ascension, and the Mission of the Holy Ghost—was deemed sufficient disposition for admission to baptism. Jesus was declared to be "both Lord and Christ": In His name was remission of sins: Risen from the dead and ascended into heaven He received from His Father the promise of the Holy Ghost which He pours forth on those justified in His name: such is the Gospel preached continuously and everywhere by the Apostles as we gather from the subsequent chapters. *Belief in the Lord Jesus Christ* was the faith necessary for admission to the Church through baptism. Here surely is found real intellectual faith (and not mere *fiducia*) and some definite dogmas of faith (and not mere filial confidence in the Heavenly Father, as liberal Protestantism would insist) laid down as conditions of grace and salvation, and *a fortiori* as qualifications necessary for admission into the Christian fold. And behold how both faith and dogmas come from extrinsic evidence and authoritative presentation—facts incompatible with modernistic theories, yet so conformable to Catholic principles.

But an interesting question presents itself: Were the earliest

<sup>7</sup> Acts III. 19.

converts made acquainted at once with the doctrine of the Trinity? Did the Apostles preach this doctrine clearly from the outset, and was *explicit* belief in the divine Son-ship of Christ, and, therefore, in the doctrine of the Trinity, considered necessary as a condition of baptism and salvation?

In the first place we must state the Catholic doctrine on this head. The Church and theologians teach that faith—real intellectual faith—is an indispensable condition of justification and salvation in the case of adults capable of acts of faith. For, as the Council of Trent teaches, “*fides est humane salutis initium, fundamentum et radix omnis justificationis, sine qua impossibile est placare Deo et ad filiorum eius consortium pervenire*”;<sup>8</sup> and as the Vatican Council supplements: “*hanc vero fidem, quae humane salutis initium est, Ecclesia catholica profitetur, virtutem esse supernaturalem, qua, Dei aspirante et adjuvante gratia, ab eo revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsicam rerum veritatem naturali rationis luminæ perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis qui nec falli nec fallere potest. Est enim fides, testante Apostolo, sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium.*”<sup>9</sup> But how far must this faith extend? In other words, what is the minimum of explicit faith demanded as essential according to the divine economy of salvation? There were not wanting eminent theologians who held that explicit faith in the Trinity and the Incarnation was indispensable to justification. But today theologians generally hold as most probable, if not certain, that such explicit faith is not absolutely necessary. They limit the absolute necessity (*necessitate medii*) of explicit faith to the doctrine of “God the Remunerator” as taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the sacred writer, after defining faith as “*sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium,*” informs us of its necessity in these words: “*Sine fide autem impossibile est placere Deo. Credere enim oportet accedentem ad Deum, quia est et inquirentibus se remunerator sit.*”<sup>10</sup> The words of Father Pesch on this matter are:

<sup>8</sup> *Sess. 6, c. 8.*

<sup>9</sup> *Sess. 3, c. 3 de Fide.*

<sup>10</sup> *Heb. xi. 6.*



"Plerique theologi ut certam vel ut probabilem sequuntur sententiam fidem Trinitatis et Christi Redemptoris explicitam esse quidem omnibus necessariam necessitate praecepti, non tamen tam absolute necessariam necessitate medii, ut in nulla conditione homo salvari possit, qui horum mysteriorum solam implicitam fidem habeat." <sup>11</sup> In favor of this view he cites such distinguished theologians as Suarez, De Lugo, and the Salmanticensis. Suarez <sup>12</sup> regards explicit faith in Christ the Redeemer and in the Trinity as necessary in the same manner as are baptism by water and church-membership; that is, necessary *necessitate medii vel in re vel in voto*. Which means that according to the divine economy of salvation they are the ordinary and necessary means, yet when inculpably omitted a substitute may be found, though compliance with the original obligation urges whenever fulfillment becomes possible.

Having stated the Catholic doctrine on the subject, and having seen that the explicit faith which is essential to salvation may be limited to two dogmas; namely, the existence of God, and of a retributive Providence, we address ourselves more freely to the consideration of the question, whether the Apostles at once on the descent of the Holy Ghost preached, and the faithful before they had received baptism believed, the formal dogma of the Blessed Trinity. The answer to this question is by no means as clear as we should be inclined to expect; for, the evidence that the God-head of Christ and the mystery of the Trinity were explicitly taught and believed from the beginning, is not so manifest and convincing. We know full well that the Apostles did not immediately, even after the descent of the Holy Ghost, realize the full content of the deposit of faith, but under the guidance of the Holy Ghost the Apostles in the infant Church, and the Church herself ever since, arrived gradually and as the times and occasions demanded, at the fuller and deeper significance of those profound mysteries taught by Christ and entrusted as a sacred deposit to their charge for the spiritual conduct of mankind throughout all

<sup>11</sup> *Compendium Theologicae Dogmaticae*, Vol. III, p. 273—Pesch, S. J.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *De Fide*, disp. XII, sect. 4.

succeeding generations. "The revelation had been made to them," says Father Rose, "and by the grace of the Holy Spirit which purified their hearts and rectified their judgment, in the course of time and events, the teaching of Jesus came back into their memory with all its distinctness and high spirituality."<sup>14</sup> We may recall as an illustration of this fact the commission to preach the Gospel to all nations, yet was a special revelation necessary to move the Apostles to the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.<sup>15</sup> Hence may we not regard it as possible and as a matter of prudence commendable that the blinding light of the mystery of the Trinity was not flashed at once on the minds of the would-be converts and neophytes, just as Christ Himself did not reveal His Godhead nor His Passion to His Apostles until He had educated them to the degree of devotion when they were capable of receiving such profound and startling truths?<sup>16</sup> Might it not be possible that the Apostles converted the first Christians to the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, in Whose name and by Whose mediation they would be saved, while not bringing into prominence the divine character of the Messiah? Afterwards, when their allegiance to Jesus as the Christ was secured and they were initiated into the Christian society, further instruction would be easy and productive of better results. For, certainly, if Jesus were proclaimed from the outset to be not only the Christ (the spiritual character of whose mission, and whose death were severe trials on the forbearance and acceptance of the listeners), but even God, the idea would have shocked and repelled even the well-disposed Jews whose central and immutable dogma of faith was monotheism. Whereas the convert who accepted on conviction Jesus as the Christ, thereby implicitly accepted all Christ stood for, as the Anointed of God—the King, the Priest, and the Prophet of the Most High—even if that involved His divinity. Christ henceforth became his leader and teacher to whose authority he submitted his mind and will and heart in matters of faith and conduct

<sup>14</sup> *Idem.* p. 125.

<sup>15</sup> *Cf. Matt. xxviii, 19; Acts, x.*

<sup>16</sup> *Cf. Matt., xvi, 21.*

and religion, just as the Catholic Church becomes all things to the convert who for some spiritual reason accepts her as his divine guide but as yet little realizing all that she means and teaches. Studying the evidence furnished by the Acts (where we read how Jesus was for the first time presented by the Apostles both to Jews and Gentiles) we should be inclined to infer that St. Peter and the other Apostles preached formally and clearly the Messianic character of Jesus while His Divinity was rather implied and in a general way suggested.

Let us pass in review some passages that may cast light on the point at issue. In his first discourse Peter, at the conclusion of his discourse, proclaims: "Let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ this same Jesus whom you have crucified." He states explicitly the Messiahship of Jesus, but not so clearly His Divinity; though the title "Lord" implies it, especially, if taken in connection with verse 21 where the covenant name of God in the old Testament (Yahweh, Lord) is to be invoked for salvation, while in the mind and teaching of the same Apostle the name of Jesus occupies a similar place in the New Testament.<sup>17</sup> In the same discourse we hear how Jesus was raised from the dead by God, and was exalted by the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, pours forth the Pentecostal gifts. All these statements, while *compatible* with the divine character of Jesus, do not *formally* teach that doctrine. Peter, asked by his hearers what they should do, answers: "Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." How were the listeners and converts to apprehend so strange and wonderful a doctrine as the Trinity and the Incarnation, if taught them in no more explicit terms? It may be remarked that once they were well-disposed towards the Gospel preached, and were willing to submit to and accept all that the Apostles offered, they were better instructed before receiving baptism. Does not verse 40 state that "with very many other words did he (Peter) tes-

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Acts, II, 22 and 36; and IV, 12.

tify and exhort them"? This is possible, and as we know was the custom of later years in dealing with catechumens; but seeing that three thousand converts were baptized on that same day,<sup>18</sup> little time remained for further instruction. In the second discourse,<sup>19</sup> Peter employs in regard to Jesus these expressions: "God hath glorified His Son (servant) Jesus": "You denied the Holy One and the Just One": "The Author of Life you killed whom God hath raised from the dead": "He shall send Him who hath been preached unto you, Jesus Christ." Questioned by the Sanhedrin about the miraculous cure of the cripple Peter with frank indignation made answer: "Be it known to you all and to all the house of Israel, that by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God hath raised from the dead, even by Him this man standeth here before you whole: neither is there salvation in any other. For there is not other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved."<sup>20</sup> While soon afterwards we are informed: "With great power did the Apostles give testimony of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord."<sup>21</sup> And in another place: "Jesus . . . hath God exalted with His right hand to be Prince and Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. And we are witnesses of these things and the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to all that obey Him."<sup>22</sup> Of the Samaritan converts we are told: "But when they had believed Phillip preaching of the kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ they were baptized both men and women;"<sup>23</sup> while afterwards Peter and John confirmed them "that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For He was not as yet come upon any of them: but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."<sup>24</sup> Saul confounded the Jews after his conversion affirming that Jesus was "the Christ" . . . the "Son of God," where the titles seemed to be used as equivalent.<sup>25</sup> Before the Centurion, Peter bears this testimony to Jesus: "And He commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is He who was appointed by God to be

<sup>18</sup> *Acts*, II, 41.<sup>19</sup> *Acts*, III.<sup>20</sup> *Acts*, IV.<sup>21-25</sup> *Cf. Acts*, IV, 33, V, 35, VIII, 12, IX, 20 and 22, X, 42.

Judge of the living and of the dead. To Him all the prophets give testimony, that by His name all receive remission of sins who believe in Him.”<sup>27</sup>

Such is the substance and the burden of the testimony borne to Jesus on every page of the Acts of the Apostles. Do the titles with which the Apostles clothe Him enable us to conclude that he was proclaimed explicitly to be God the Son, and that the earliest Christians believed Him to be such before receiving baptism? Perhaps: yet were all converts obliged, before admission into the Church by baptism to make an explicit profession of faith in the Trinity we shall find it hard to explain the vagaries and uncertainties of so many of the ante-Nicene writers in regard to the dogma of the Trinity.<sup>28</sup> Whereas this fact would be intelligible on the hypothesis that the earliest converts to Christianity while making formal profession of faith in Jesus as the promised Messiah who redeemed mankind by His death, and through whose mediation the kingdom of God was established wherein men are reconciled to God, and who, being exalted to the right hand of God, was appointed Lord of all and Judge of the living and the dead, yet was their recognition of His divine Sonship as the Second Person of the Trinity only vague and informal; in other words while His offices and attributes were divine, His nature and character were not openly declared to be on the same level as His Father's. Be the answer to the question raised what it may, one fact is certain, that real and explicit faith in certain doctrines or dogmas was regarded *ab initio* as an essential condition of salvation and of initiation into the Christian fold. For this reason a common name for the true followers of Christ in the infant Church was, and ever since has been, *Believers*.

### *Baptism.*

Besides faith and repentance something more was needed to constitute one a member of Christ's Church. These were only dispositions which qualified one for admission. The rite of

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *Arius of Fourth Century*—Newman.

initiation whereby he was justified and introduced into the kingdom of Christ and became subject to His Church was Baptism. "Unless one be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved but he that believes not shall be condemned."<sup>30</sup> In compliance with the Master's teaching, St. Peter prescribes the way of salvation for the sincere inquirers in these words: "Do penance and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ . . . They, therefore, that received his word were baptized, and there were added in that day about three thousand souls." Likewise throughout the whole narrative of the Acts we find baptism insisted on and ever practised as the rite whereby one became a member of the Christian community, an associate of the brethren of Christ. Thereby he was born again in Christ, and through Christ became an adopted son of God and a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Hence we find that even St. Paul, whose conversion was miraculous, and the Centurion, whose prior reception of the Holy Ghost was exceptional, introduced into the Christian Church by the rite of baptism.<sup>31</sup> Thus was the visible ceremony recognized as the indispensable means of church-membership and of Christian salvation. By its virtue were sins washed away and men incorporated in the mystical body of Christ, and made visible members of the society which professed the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ.

A difficulty arises in regard to the form employed in the conferring of baptism. "Be baptized . . . in the name of Jesus Christ," and not in the name of the Holy Trinity? There were theologians who held such a view, on the strength of the above and similar passages which occur in the Acts.<sup>32</sup> But the words do not necessarily mean that the form of baptism invoked Jesus Christ and not the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For the Greek words used to express "in the name of Jesus Christ" mean (according to one or other of two readings) by the authority of Jesus Christ or into the faith and

<sup>30</sup> *John* III, 5; *Mk.* XVI, 16.

<sup>31</sup> *Acts*, IX, 18, x, 47.

<sup>32</sup> *Acts*, XIII, 16, x, 48, XIX, 5.

religion of Jesus Christ,<sup>33</sup> where in either case there is no reference to the form of the Sacrament. Such is the usage in chapter 3 where Peter, addressing the cripple, commands: "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth arise and walk." Accordingly, whenever the believers are said to be baptized in the name of Christ the meaning is that they are baptized with the baptism instituted by Christ, and embrace the faith which is in Christ Jesus to whose keeping they entrust themselves and into whose mystical body, the Church, they become incorporated by the sacramental rite. The opinion of those theologians who held that baptism in the name of Jesus Christ was for a time valid has against it the whole tradition and practise of the Church, as well as the teaching of the early Fathers, and the implication of the words of St. Paul in regard to the converts at Ephesus, when he expresses surprise that any one could have received Christian baptism without having heard mention of the Holy Ghost.<sup>34</sup> Hence it is more than likely that the formula given at the close of St. Matthew's Gospel as commanded by Christ was in use always. Thus alone can we account for the absence of evidence for a transition which must have been rather marked were baptism administered in the Infant Church in the name of Jesus Christ, but later in the name of the Blessed Trinity.<sup>35</sup>

Let us pause for a moment to contemplate the full significance of the change that has taken place in the lives of those three thousand converts. They receive the word of the Gospel which Peter preached; they repent: they believe in Jesus Christ; and they are baptized and thus "are added" to the

<sup>33</sup> *Actus Apostolorum*—Steenkiste, on *Acts*, II, 38, and *La Theologie de Saint Paul*, II, p. 340—F. Prat.

<sup>34</sup> *Acts*, XIX, 13; Cf., *Catholic Ency.*, II, p. 263, Art. "Baptism."

<sup>35</sup> The question may suggest itself: If the first Christians were baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, how had they not explicit faith in the Trinity? But the Trinitarian form of baptism is quite compatible with an explicit profession of faith in Jesus as the Christ only. Of course, the whole question requires closer investigation and fuller treatment than can be devoted to it in the present article, whose object is to indicate the general conditions needed for Church membership. The matter may be dealt with at greater length in a further contribution.

number of the disciples of Christ. To realise the full bearing of this event is to understand the purport of the Gospel Message, as taught throughout the whole of the New Testament. The reign of God foretold by the prophets has been introduced through the presence of Jesus on earth. He is the Mediator of God's redeeming love. He reveals the universal Fatherhood of God, and all men are invited into a spiritual union of love with the Heavenly Father through His mediation. Certain conditions are demanded for the admission of men into the Kingdom of God's Love, whose Saviour and Sovereign is Jesus Christ. These conditions are *sorrow for sin* which is so inimical to God's sway; *Faith in Jesus Christ* whereby the sinner accepts Jesus as the Divine Mediator, the Revealer of God, the Saviour of mankind, and the Guide to salvation; and *Baptism* by which the contrite believer is made a citizen of Christ's Kingdom, and a subject of His authority, and therefore prepared to live the new life of grace exacted by that authority. Well does St. Paul express this idea in the epistle to the Galatians: "You are all children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond or free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus."<sup>36</sup> "Baptism" as a certain writer remarks, "conferred incorporation in the one body of Christ (1 *Cor.*, 12, 13) and was thus adapted to serve as a symbol of the true unity of Christians." (*Ephes.* 4-5.)<sup>37</sup>

### *Social Life.*

Such is the spiritual transformation effected in the converts to Christianity; but the social transformations was equally pronounced. A New Society comes into existence whose members are differentiated from the rest of mankind and united together not by racial or national ties but by spiritual bonds of a common faith, a common moral code, and a common spiritual

<sup>36</sup> *Gal.*, III, 26.

<sup>37</sup> *Hastings' Dict. of Bible*—Art. "Baptism," p. 83.



worship in Jesus Christ, all controlled and regulated by a common religious authority vested by Christ in His Apostles—the *authorized Witnesses of His Gospel*. For to believe in Christ means (as Père Prat, analyzing the notion of faith in the teaching of St. Paul, points out) to accept Him as Saviour, to confide in His mediation, and *to submit to His Law*.<sup>38</sup> Who accepts Christ by faith accepts Him without reservation, and hence must be ready to submit his mind to Christ's doctrine, his will to Christ's moral law, and to comply with the cult which Christ has instituted. By baptism he submits himself to the authority which Christ has established on earth to represent Himself after His Ascension into heaven. As a certain author well declares, the Evangelists distinguish between the "preaching of the Gospel" and the "teaching" of Jesus. By the preaching of the Gospel Jesus proclaims the fact that the Messianic King had come and that His Kingdom was about to be established; whereas His "teaching" was ethical, "It was connected with the Kingdom, being the legislation that befitted such a Kingdom of grace. It was an ethical code intended to guide those who have previously accepted the Gospel. The teaching of Jesus is the law-book of the Kingdom; the Gospel of Jesus is the Manifesto of the Kingdom, explaining its nature and inviting all to become its citizens." The commission given to the Apostles by Christ after His Resurrection confirms this view: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them *to observe all things* whatsoever I have commanded you."<sup>39</sup> Hence belief and baptism alone do not save one; further he must obey God's will made manifest through Christ. "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them he it is that loveth me."<sup>40</sup>

<sup>38</sup> "Outre l'adhésion intellectuelle, la foi sincère implique une soumission tacite et virtuelle aux devoirs qu' impose le christianisme."—*La Théologie de Saint Paul*, II, p. 339.—F. Prat, S. J. Compare also p. 344, *Ib.*

<sup>39</sup> *Hastings' Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, I, p. 661. Art. "Gospel."

<sup>40</sup> *Matt.*, XIX, 17, 4; *Jo.* XIV, 21.

By analogy we can well understand how faith (*John* 3, 16), baptism (*John* 3, 5), and obedience (*Matt.* 19, 17), are all necessary for membership in the Church of Christ, through which one attains eternal life. The same is true of membership in any society, where one desires, as it were by an act of faith in its principles, to become a member, after which he is incorporated by a process of initiation, when he becomes subject to its authority and must, if he would continue a member in good standing and enjoy its privileges, abide by its laws and ordinances as determined for the members by the governing body. Such is a perfect analogy for the social life of the Christian church. Faith is an indispensable disposition of mind and heart whereby the prospective member professes his belief in Christ as the Divine Teacher and in His Gospel as the way of salvation and in His Church as the authority instituted by Christ to perpetuate His work. Afterwards he is admitted to baptism—the rite whereby he is incorporated in the Church of Christ, and becomes subject to its authority (represented at the outset by the College of Apostles), when he must accept its doctrines and obey its commands and share in its worship and practices, as determined for him by the divine authority whereby the Christian society is governed. Should one baptized deny or disbelieve the Church's doctrine he becomes a heretic, should he obstinately disobey and repudiate her mandates he becomes a schismatic, should he fail to participate in her ritual he becomes a sinner, for none can long persevere in grace who nourishes not his soul with the divine helps which Christ has intrusted to the ministry of His Church. "Let a man so account of us," says St. Paul, "as the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God (*1 Cor.* 4, 1)." A baptized person never can cease to be a Christian; but, in so far does he fall short of the fullness of Christian life and is removed from the direct path to salvation as he fails to comply with the intellectual, moral, and religious demands made on his allegiance by the authority of Christ's Church to which he has irrevocably become subject by the reception of the indelible character of baptism.

The foregoing may seem an unnecessary digression; but such an explanation will enable us to realize the full significance of faith and baptism to the Christian convert, whose life is thereby brought into complete subjection to the Gospel and religion of Christ and His Church. No longer is he exposed to be carried about by every wind of doctrine; no longer is he free to hold his own opinions in matters religious and moral; no longer may he indulge his fancy in doubts and perplexities, and rejoice in the dubious freedom of thought and liberty of conduct which is theirs who, seated in darkness and in the shadow of death, know not Jesus Christ. For he has bowed his head to the sweet yoke of Christ and must be guided by His Gospel as determined for him by the authorized witnesses of Christ in whom his divine authority resides and is perpetuated.

In the light of this brief disquisition we at once appreciate the significance of the remaining verses of *Acts* II, which give us a faint, but suggestive glimpse into the life of the earliest Christian converts: "And they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayer. . . . And all they that believed were together, and had all things in common. . . . And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved." Now the salient features of this narrative (to which our English translation does but scant justice and which therefore to be rightly understood must be studied in the Greek original) make manifest that in the infant Christianity, immediately after Pentecost, existed the seeds that later ripened into full-blown Catholicism. The believers were "together"—formed one society, joined together in a common fellowship, were of "one heart and one soul"; under the government of the Apostles who, headed by Peter, preached to outsiders the Gospel of Christ, determined the conditions of admission into the Christian community, and instructed more fully the initiated brethren, who listened attentively to their teaching, while all joined in the liturgical service of the Breaking of the Bread, wherein the Apostles celebrated the Eucharist and communicated the faith-

ful. Such in substance is the content of the brief narrative as interpreted from the Greek.<sup>41</sup>

Well may we inquire whether liberal Protestantism or conservative Catholicism finds its prototype in this picture. Is it not wholly incompatible in its tenor with the theories of "private judgment" and of the "religion of the spirit" which repudiate the control of all external authority, which imposes on the individual dogmas and laws and ritual observances? On the contrary do we not discover therein the legitimate source of those principles and practices that flourish in the Catholic Church? In the College of the Apostles we find that hierarchical authority which preaches with full consciousness of divine power the word of God, and imposes on the consciences of men belief in the undiluted Gospel, and exacts intellectual and moral conformity with its doctrinal, ethical and religious teachings; while the individual convert is certainly not free to pick and choose, but accepts whole-heartedly and without reservation the complete doctrine of the Apostles. And in later years, as we learn from other parts of the New Testament, when some persons did question or reject certain doctrines taught and handed down by the Apostles they were driven out of the Church while the Apostles, or the Church, specified anew what should be believed and what repudiated.<sup>42</sup> Likewise did the Apostles exercise their power to command and punish the observance and violation of the moral law;<sup>43</sup> while theirs was the authority to determine the rites and ceremonies and conditions that should belong to Liturgical Worship.<sup>44</sup> Do we not here recognize at work that same authority and those same principles that operate in the Catholic Church down the ages, and which have issued in that marvelous dogmatic, moral, and ritual system which is the admiration of even the unbelieving world, and which serves as the bulwark of the supernatural against the inroads of rationalism and materialism and every other sys-

<sup>41</sup> Ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. (*Acts*, II, 42).

<sup>42</sup> *Acts*, xv, *Gal.* I., 1 *Tim.*, iv.

<sup>43</sup> *Acts*, vii; 1 *Cor.* 1.

<sup>44</sup> 1 *Cor.*, xi.

tem of free thought, and against every new framed fancy of the over-inventive but unstable human brain, that would dissolve the supernatural and undermine and dissipate the work of the Incarnate God, and overthrow (if it were possible) the Kingdom of Ghrist.

But enough has been said to show how true to its origin is the Catholic Religion. Is not then the Catholic doctrine justified when (as we stated in the opening sentence of the former article) it teaches that in the economy of grace established under the New Dispensation, for the salvation of the individual, God insists upon two conditions—Christian Faith and Church Membership? And might we not add, a rational intellectual faith and membership in an authoritative church? Both conditions are perfectly realized in the Catholic church alone, where a common faith, a common obedience, and a common worship unite in closest bonds of concord and charity all the faithful, and where the corporate and social union is sustained and propagated by that divine authority which Christ bestowed on the Apostles, and which is handed down intact by an unbroken line of succession to the Episcopate of each succeeding generation, and thus the multitude of true believers have still but one heart and one soul, for all render a glad submission to the ancient faith which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

C. F. CREMIN.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY,  
ST. PAUL, MINN.

## LEGAL LITERATURE AMONG THE ARABIC-SPEAKING CHURCHES.

---

Whenever we speak of the Orient, we are wont to associate with this term an idea of mental stagnation and fossilised traditionalism. Indeed, if we judge only from our own times this unfavorable judgment is not without good foundation; it is only too true that the East, the Christian Churches not excluded, is in a sad and thoroughly static condition. Yet, this was not always so. Centuries and even millenniums before the European nations emerged from barbarism, there was in the Orient a far-reaching and highly developed civilization. For many centuries before the Christian era the East had attained a degree of culture which to us of the twentieth century appears well-nigh impossible for such times and conditions. This is true not only with regard to the two nations who shaped the political fate of ancient Asia and Africa, the Assyro-Babylonians on the one hand and the Egyptians on the other, but also, and to a like extent, with regard to the minor peoples who received their vitality and their mental stimulus from their powerful neighbors. In what language or in what nation could we find a literary work that could be compared with the book of Job in force of language and energy of expression?

This mental activity and intellectual aspiration still continued after the victorious march of Christianity into the land of the rising sun. Of course after the time of Christ the Oriental civilisation assumed an aspect different from that which it previously had. Both the radical changes in religious ideas which imposed thoughts of the other world and deeply influenced every day life and actions and the shifting of the political power from the East to the West are responsible for the welding of Greek and Asiatic cultures into that harmonious compound which we call the Christian Hellenism.

To instance the high degree of civilisation among the Christian peoples of the Orient it suffices to mention here one example, that of the Syrians. A glance at the literature of this interesting people will give us some idea of the nature and extension of culture in the Oriental world of that epoch. There is scarcely a field of study which now commands our attention that had not been carefully surveyed by the early Syrian Christians. Among them we find the earliest and most important versions of Holy Writ. Of the New Testament alone there are at the very dawn of Christianity no fewer than three translations: the Diatessaron of Tatian, the Curetonian and the Sinaitic versions. The number of commentaries on the Scriptures and treatises on other sacred sciences is astounding. Many of them are of comparatively great value and in importance rank with the well-known productions of contemporaneous Occidental writers. As in Theology proper, so in every branch of literature the Syrians had accomplished much. We find works on medicine and natural science, on mathematics and philosophy, on philology and history, on poetry and belles-lettres. There are not lacking among the writers even freethinkers who were as modern in their views for those times as their successors for our own day.

This highly developed civilisation of the Syrians we find paralleled among the other Oriental Christian nations wherever similar conditions of national development prevailed. There were many sound reasons why the great fathers of the early Church were Orientals, real Orientals, who spoke at home their native Syriac or Coptic. And there were equally sound reasons why the great Patriarchs of Constantinople and elsewhere were Orientals. It was for the same reason too that so many and so great heresies arose in the Orient, for heresies based on philosophical grounds and directing their blows directly against intellectual dogmas can arise only where a highly developed knowledge of philosophy and of dogmatic speculation is familiar to all, in a word where there are mental preoccupations and a high degree of culture.

It is certainly true that the West had its great Fathers and

Theologians and that it also had its dogmatical fights, but there is no denying that the intellectual centre of gravity was not found in the Occidental world, but in the East, and there not so much in Byzantium as in Asia proper.

The culture of the Christian Orient was so great that at times it influenced the civilisation of the entire world. The Christian Orient gave Aristotle to them who introduced him to the West and made possible the development of Scholastic Theology. Furthermore the latest answers to the question: "Rome or the East?" tend to make us realize that even such branches as liturgy and ecclesiastical art which we have been accustomed to consider as characteristics of the Roman Church had their sources in the Oriental civilisation.

But strange to say this Christian Oriental civilisation which for the first seven centuries of our era maintained itself in all its beauty has now completely disappeared and sunk back into utter darkness. The old axiom that civilisation and intellectual culture can thrive only among peoples who are enjoying national independence and political freedom and can thrive only as long as they enjoy them has been verified also in regard to the Orient. With the Arabic invasion into the Christian Orient all the cultural life which the conquered people had enjoyed through so many centuries began to wane.

Of course a civilisation such as that which we now consider does not die in a day; centuries may come and go witnessing its decline and its death-struggle; but die it will and must when the death-blow has been given to a people by depriving it of its national existence. The Christian civilisation could not withstand that of the invaders as the Roman civilisation in Gaul had withstood that of the victorious Franks, Burgundians, Normans, and other Germanic tribes. For unlike the Germanic tribes the Arabian invaders came with a real culture, a culture full of vitality and the power to conquer. The Islamic civilisation had drawn in and assimilated the treasures of Greek and Christian life. It was a civilisation carried on by an enormous religious idealism which conceived and fostered all branches of knowledge



even medicine and philology as parts of theology which was with them the only great science. Such a civilisation strongly supported by the political development, patronized by numerous caliphs and princes, and eagerly assimilated by all muslims to whatever state or nation they belonged could not but stamp out and eventually obliterate any civilisation which it met on its victorious march.

It is true that in the first three centuries after the Islamic invasion we find a great many flourishing writers among the Oriental Christians; and moreover, for some time it seemed as though Christian civilisation might survive the Islamic oppression, so vigorously did it react against the latter. But this was only the last spark of fading life; the Islamic civilisation maintained its victory.

However, there was one branch of literature which flourished even during the period of decay *viz.*, the purely ecclesiastical literature dealing with apologetics, liturgy, and jurisprudence.

This body of literature bore clearly the marks of the conditions out of which it was born. For some time after the Arabic invasion the conquered nations still had a number of highly educated laymen and ecclesiastics. It was only natural that such men whose usefulness was deeply appreciated by the Arabic princes and made serviceable to their interests should still retain in their writings some elements of the older Christian culture. Thus the ecclesiastic literature of the first two centuries after the invasion is of real literary value and oftentimes vies with the Islamic Arabic writers in beauty of language and form. Moreover it covers an extensive field of culture. As the time went on, however, the educated Oriental world turned more and more to Islamism. The comparatively small Christian community which survived the first centuries after the invasion had gradually become so impoverished that its members were almost totally unlettered. No wonder that they did not feel any need of a highly polished literature! It stood to reason that the kind of language they wrote and read in their ecclesiastical literature was much removed from the elegant classical language of the earlier writers.

In the field of ecclesiastical literature the branch which developed most, was that of jurisprudence and this resulted from peculiar circumstances chief among which was the legal status of the Christian population as a distinct social and religious body within the Islamic world. Notwithstanding the heavy yoke which the Christians had to bear they were always allowed to arrange their domestic affairs according to their own Christian laws. And they enjoyed this comparative autonomy not only in purely ecclesiastical matters but in all their relations with other Christians of the same or different communities. For instance the bishops alone were the recognized lawgivers for their own people in all matters pertaining to wills and bequests and were even the competent judges in criminal causes among Christians. And by their very position they were bound not only to take a special interest in all matters pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction but also to contribute their share in the production of legal literature. These men were of course the best educated class in the Christian Church and their writings were naturally of superior literary merit.

This development in the jurisprudential literature began immediately after the Arabic invasion and its best period extends from the ninth to the fourteenth century. After the fifteenth century there is no literary production of note in jurisprudence. This is true of all Semitic nations upon which the Arabic language was imposed.

By far the larger part of the Christian Oriental works on jurisprudence are written in Arabic. This is due to the fact that from the tenth century onward the Arabic language had completely superseded all the other Oriental languages. Original Syriac and Coptic had disappeared from the cities and were used only in far-distant rural or mountainous districts.

The Arabic-speaking Christians are not united in one church or communion. There are Nestorians in the far East, Mesopotamia, and Persia; Jacobites in the Western part of Asia, in the South of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, whilst in the Libanon the Maronite Uniats are found. All these different religious bodies have a legal literature written in Arabic. Yet

Arabic literature developed mostly in Egypt among the Copts; their share is larger than that of all the other Churches put together.

In the later Middle Ages the Arabic legal literature was entirely unknown to the West. There was indeed no reason compelling the Occident to take any special interest in the later Arabic literature of the East. The West had at that time a theological system, the Scholastic, which was immeasurably better than the degenerated Oriental Theology. After many struggles the Roman Patriarch had successfully established his primacy over all the other Patriarchates which in former times had so often and so stubbornly fought for their independence. Moreover the Oriental Churches stood entirely apart from the Occidental Church in spite of the many attempts to bring about a union. And lastly, the temporal power had been taken away from the Orient by "The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation." So it was most natural that Occidental Christianity should lose its interest in the Christian Orient at least in regard to ecclesiastical and religious sciences. The Orient could only be considered as a missionary country, not as a source of ecclesiastical life or cultural development.

With exception of a few isolated notices the West received its first knowledge of the rich Arabic jurisprudential literature in the second half of the sixteenth century; and even then of only a very small part of the entire literature. It consisted only of Arabic canons of the Council of Nice. These canons were discovered and copied by I.-B. Romain, first translated by Francis Torrès (Turrianus), and first published by Alfonse Pisani in his history of the Council of Nice (Dillingen 1572, and in greater conformity with the Arabic original again, Cologne, 1581). A new translation, based on a larger number of manuscripts, was published by the first translator of the canons, Torrès, in 1578. More than half a century later a Maronite, Abraham Ecchellensis, translated the same Arabic canons of the Council of Nice from a recension differing from that used by Torrès. He published the new translation with a learned introduction in Paris, 1641. All these publications stirred up

a controversy on the genuineness of the canons; it was defended especially by Torrès, Abraham Ecchellensis, and Cardinal d'Aiguirre, but was rejected by almost all students of jurisprudence and history. A few more discoveries in the field of Arabic legal literature were published by the famous English canonist William Beveridge in his monumental *Synodicon, sive Pandectae canonum Apostolorum et conciliorum ab Ecclesia Graeca receptorum*, Oxford, 1672.

Incomparably more however is due to a man who presented almost the entire Arabic legal literature in its contours to the eyes of the Western scholars. This man is Johann Michael Wansleben.

Johann Michael Wansleben was born November 1, 1635, in Sommerda, near Erfurt, in Germany, the son of a Lutheran minister. Having studied Oriental languages, especially Arabic and Ethiopic under Hiob Ludolf, he was recommended by his teacher to the Duke Ernst of Gotha for a religious and political mission to Egypt and Abyssinia. Entrusted with this mission he left Germany in the summer of 1663 and went to Egypt. Very soon, however, in the beginning of the year 1665 he abandoned his mission and sailed for Italy where he became a Catholic. In the following year he received the habit of Saint Dominic in the convent of the Dominicans sopra Minerva in Rome. In 1670 he followed the Bishop of Montpellier, Bosquet, to Paris, where he was introduced to Colbert, the Minister of Louis XIV. His endeavours to be sent to the Orient for political and scientific purposes were finally crowned with success. He left Paris in the year 1671. His trip led him by way of Malta, Cyprus, Tripoli in Syria, Damascus, Sidon, to Egypt where he arrived April 14, 1672. Having spent the years 1672 and 1673 in Egypt he set out for home October 16, 1673 by way of Rhodus, Chios, Smyrna and Constantinople, arriving in Paris in March, 1676. During his trip he had bought almost two thousand manuscripts of different languages which were sent by the French consuls to the Royal library in Paris. The Bibliothèque Nationale, formerly Bibliothèque Royale of Paris is very rich in Christian

Oriental manuscripts, most of which are due to the indefatigable zeal and the astonishing cleverness of Wansleben. This characteristic ability of Wansleben is very well given in a letter written to him by Arnoul, Intendant Général des Galères du Roy. After having expressed his wish to receive as many curiosities as possible Arnoul says: "Vous qui estes omnis homo et au delà il ne vous en faut pas dire davantage pour vous trasser un chemin de réussir."

The literary harvest from these travels includes the following works: 1) a small report addressed to the Duke Ernst of Gotha on his first travel of the year 1664 under the title: *Beschreybung des Egypten Landes nach dem Zustand des Jahres 1664, von einem reysenden Teutschen in teutscher Sprach beschrieben*. This report is preserved in the ms. hist. 835 in the University Library of Göttingen; 2) *Relazione dello stato presente dell'Egitto* (Paris, 1671); 3) *Conspectus operum Aethiopicorum quae ad excudendum habet parata Joannes Michael Vanslebius* (Paris, 1671); 4) A journal of his travel, written in Italian in Constantinople in the year 1675; it is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds italien, No. 435, but not yet published; 5) *Nouvelle relation en forme de journal d'un voyage fait en Égypte par le P. Vansleb R. D. en 1672 et 1673* (Paris, 1677). This is an extract from the journal mentioned under No. 4; 6) *Histoire de l'Église d'Alexandrie fondée par St. Marc que nous appelons celle des Jacobites Coptes d'Égypte écrite au Caire même en 1672 et 1673 par le P. J.-M. Vansleb, Dominicain du Couvent de la Minerve à Rome* (Paris, 1677).

This last work of Wansleben's is very modest in external appearance; it contains only about 350 pages in small octavo. Nevertheless it is of the highest value for a knowledge of Arabic ecclesiastical law. Almost the entire book presents matters new to his contemporaries, it deserves therefore special attention. Chapters 1-5 treat of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the customs and state of the Coptic Church, its faith and ceremonies. In the sixth chapter he gives a list of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and in the seventh catalogue of famous men

especially of the Alexandrian Church. The most important chapter, however, is the fifth which treats on the legal status *ex professo*. In the first part of this chapter under the heading: *des canons des Apôtres* he treats of the 56 and the 81 *canones Apostolorum* and of the *Didascalia* and touches upon the so-called *Laws of the Old Testament*, the *Letter of St. Peter to Clement* and the 84 *canones Apostolorum*. In the second part: *des canons que l'église a receus*, he speaks of the canons of the general councils of Nice I, Constantinople I, Ephesus and Chalcedon and of the provincial councils of Neocaesarea or, as it is mostly called in the Orient, of Carthage, Antiochia, Laodicea, Gangra, and Sardica. In the third part: *des canons des Patriarches et autres qui n'ont pas été de leur église*, he deals with the canons of Abulides (Hippolytos), Basil, John Chrysostome, Athanasius (the so-called canons of Epiphanius). In the fifth part: *des canons qui ont été faits par leur propres Patriarches et maitres de l'église*, he mentions the canons of Athanasius, (19th Patriarch of Alexandria); Cyrill (67th Patriarch); Christodulos (Abd el Mesikh, 70th Patriarch); Gabriel ben Tureik (71st Patriarch); Cyrill ben Laqlaq (74th Patriarch) and the canons of the Masters of the Church.

Wansleben's scientific although very short description of Arabic ecclesiastical law was the first communication made to the Western world on that subject. Now of course it looks rather meagre, but for Wansleben's time it was undoubtedly of the greatest value and for more than two centuries remained almost the exclusive source of all the knowledge that the West possessed about Arabic ecclesiastical law. In spite of all the scientific qualities of Wansleben's and of his great success as a traveller, he fell into disgrace with the Minister of Colbert. He died in the year 1679 as Vicaire of Bourron, a very small village near Fontainebleau.

Wansleben's success is due especially to his teacher Hiob Ludolf, who also did meritorious work in unveiling the treasures of the East to the eyes of the Western scholars. Ludolf, it is true, had studied mainly the Ethiopic legal literature, but it must be remembered that the legal code of Ethiopia is for the

greater part a mere translation of Arabic legal works and was dependent upon these even in its development. Thus his merit lies not only in having directed Wansleben in his studies but also in having promoted the knowledge of Arabic jurisprudence through its Ethiopic rendition in his famous *Commentarius in suam Historiam Aethiopicam*.

The work begun by Wansleben was continued and in some way completed by Eusebius Renaudot in his monumental *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum a D. Marco usque ad finem saeculi XIII, etc.*, (Paris, 1713), a work which down to our own times has remained the standard on this subject. In this work he calls attention to Arabic legal literature and mentions especially the famous Nomocanon of Ibn el Assal.

Interest in the Arabic legal literature was now awakened and it is no wonder that Joseph Simon Assemani, to whom Western Christianity owes most of its acquaintance with the Christian East, should also have followed on the same lines. Single remarks and notes are found in his catalogues of Oriental Manuscripts and especially in his great *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, a work unfortunately never completed. Realizing the great importance of Arabic legal literature, he entertained the idea of collecting all the canons extant in Arabic ascribed either to the Apostles or Councils or to the Fathers or finally to certain Patriarchs. He had planned to publish them all in many folio volumes, but his plan could not be carried out. He had collected almost all the canons contained in manuscripts of the Vatican Library when he died in January, 1768. All that is left of his collection are the manuscripts Cod. Vat. Arab. 631-635.

After his death the research work on Arabic legal literature stopped again. True, there are many scattered notices in our catalogues of the Arabic manuscripts preserved in European libraries, especially those of Oxford, London, and Paris, but work begun by Wansleben and planned by Assemani was not continued systematically.

The nineteenth century, however, witnessed a new advance in the study of this vast and important field. Johann Wilhelm

Bickell, convinced of the necessity of studying more deeply Arabic legal literature, proposed in the first volume of his *History of Ecclesiastical jurisprudence* (Giessen, 1843) to create a *Corpus Canonum Arabicorum* which should contain a complete collection of all canons and legal codes still preserved among the Arabic-speaking Churches.

It goes without saying that this *Corpus Canonum Arabicorum* has never been published. The time was not yet ripe for such vast an undertaking. A collection like that one intended by Bickell needs many preparatory works. There were scattered in various libraries hundreds and hundreds of manuscripts which could not possibly be overlooked. The number was indeed so great that they could not be collected or copied by any one man or even a single group of scholars. And finally the expense which such a collection would entail was simply prohibitive. Thus the nineteenth century passed without seeing the publication of the *Corpus Canonum Arabicorum*.

Nevertheless, the interest once awakened in this wide field did not slacken. In the year 1869 Bonifatius Haneberg published the first Arabic canons in Arabic language in the *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Muenchen*. These were the canons of Hippolytos. Although this publication cannot be said to be perfect, it created much surprise because it showed that a great store of information on the earliest institutions had been preserved in Arabic. The controversy which immediately followed helped to rivet the attention of the investigators on this kind of literature and very soon gave rise to a general movement to make this literature better known, partly by improving both text and translation of Haneberg's publication, partly by the publication of essays and studies on some selected portions, and partly by the edition of individual smaller texts. To this preparatory work belong, among others, the researches of Achelis on the canones Hippolyti, Funk's and Drey's publications on the Apostolic Constitutions, and several articles by A. Baumstark on the same and similar subjects. Texts have been published by G. Horner in his *Canones Apostolorum* which were re-edited in much better form by the



brothers Perrier. Riedel and Crum published the *Canones of Athanasius*. Also one of the *Nomocanons* has been printed, the *Medicina Spiritualis* of an anonymous author (text and translation with very many notes in *Oriens Christianus*, 1906-1908).

Towards the end of the last century Wilhelm Riedel, at that time Privatdozent at Kiel University and later Professor at Greifswald University, took it upon himself to make the inventory of the entire Arabic legal literature. The result of his painstaking work is found in his excellent book: *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien zusammengestellt und zum Teil uebersetzt*, Leipzig, 1900. It is true that Riedel made many and strange mistakes, but this could hardly be avoided by one doing pioneer work almost constantly. In spite of all the errors contained his book remains the main source of information and is quite indispensable as a basis on which all succeeding editors and investigators will mainly depend at least for their first information.

Riedel's work is the first step and most necessary one to the much-needed *Corpus Canonum Arabicorum*. But it is not the only step which has brought us nearer to that end. A very welcome help is found in the application of photography to the reproduction of manuscripts. By a new process, the so-called White on Black photography, it is possible to obtain in a very short time and at little expense the photographic reproduction of the manuscripts scattered in many libraries, so that the old unreliable method of copying by hand is entirely and fortunately abandoned.

Taking advantage of all these favorable conditions, the *Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium*, now taken over by the two Catholic Universities of America and Louvain, has undertaken the publication of a collection of the entire Arabic legal literature in a *Corpus fontium Juris Canonici et Civilis Christiani Arabicum*.

This *Corpus Juris* shall contain the following *Fontes*:

A. Textus. 1. *Nomocanones*

Michaelis Damiettensis

Anonymi (*Medicina Spiritualis*)

Ibn el Assal

Farag Allah Achmimensis

Abu Sulh et tractatus speciales

2. Scripta Apostolica

Didascalia

Libri Clementis et Epistula Petri ad  
Clementem

Canones Apostolorum (71. 84. 56. 81. 82)

Traditiones Patrum Apostolorum et scripta  
minora

3. Decreta Conciliorum

Generalium et Particularium

4. Canones Patrum

5. Libri quattuor Regum

6. Decreta Patriarcharum Posteriorum praecipue  
Alexandrinorum

7. Varia praesertim ad historiam Canonum et  
jurisprudentiae spectantia

B. Translationes operum supradictorum.

Of course such a vast undertaking, for which 40 volumes are provided, cannot be finished in one year, but because it has been entrusted to one hand alone it is hoped that the whole Corpus Juris Arabicum will be finished in a uniform manner in a relatively short time.

Whatever may be thought of the *literary* value of the Arabic legal literature of the Christian Churches, there can be no doubt of the great importance, and first of all in regard to the history of the inner life of the Eastern Churches. We are certainly not over-modest when we confess that we know almost nothing on that subject for the period following the subjugation of the Christian Orient by the Arabic invaders. Of still greater importance is this Arabic legal literature to the students of the history of ecclesiastical institutions and laws of primitive Christianity. Everybody knows that our modern ecclesiastical institutions are in many respects far removed from those of the first Christian centuries. The West was

always progressive, trying to modernize the old traditions in order to make them agree with the needs of later times. On the contrary, the Orient excelled in preserving intact the heirloom of antiquity and in checking the progress of life by the standard of past centuries. This is exactly what happened in regard to the jurisprudence of the Arabic-speaking Churches. There we find laws and institutions going back to primitive Christianity. And although the form in which the traditions have been preserved is often due to later times and even bears the marks of direct falsification, nevertheless their foundation reaches far back into antiquity and sometimes leads almost to the Apostolic or the early Patristic period.

FRANZ J. COELN.

## SHELLEY AND FRANCIS THOMPSON

---

The collected prose of Francis Thompson has recently been edited by Mr. Wilfrid Meynell, who has, thereby, rendered a further service to literature. In this edition first place is rightly accorded the essay on Shelley, which is not only the most considerable because of its length, but also most characteristic in thought and style. For Thompson is the joint product of Crashaw and Shelley—Shelley of whom he wrote that, though “an anti-Christian in ethics, the blood in the veins of his Muse was Christian.” As regards form and expression, the noble prose of Thompson is here at its best, free from later neologisms, and reveals new possibilities of melody in the lesser art of English letters. It is our present purpose to examine the value of its contents in the light of recent criticism.

This posthumous essay ranks with the outstanding pieces of creative criticism in English literature. When we recall the early reviews of writings since become classics—judgments like the famous “this will never do” of the Edinburgh reviewer—the importance of such work will best be realized. Genius creates the canons by which it is to be judged; it is its own *raison d'être*. By its very nature it cannot conform to conventional standards of criticism and so needs a creative mind to interpret it. As Coleridge in his “*Biographia Literaria*” was the first really to estimate the genius of Wordsworth, it has remained for Francis Thompson to write the apologia of Shelley. All who have ever fallen under the spell of this unique poet must have felt how difficult it was to reconcile the various views of his biographers. His personality was a tangled skein of mingled yarn, good and ill together. Matthew Arnold’s essay sums up all the damning facts which can be alleged against him—and they are all true. Yet, as he admits, when all has been said, the ideal Shelley still survives. For of him especially it is true that his character was better than his acts, and no merely literal tests are adequate for the poetic content of his life. His friend Hogg’s “*Life of Shelley*,” which idealizes the poet, supplies a

truth of sympathy which is a necessary corrective of such analysis. Prof. Dowden's well-meant biography, though scientific and accurate in detail, yet leaves an adverse impression because of misplaced zeal and misguided judgment. Browning's introduction to the spurious letters gives a synthetic view which is precised and completed by the present essay. Only, while both have the divining power of one poet for the genius of another—for god knows god, however far apart they dwell—Francis Thompson, because more akin in nature and sympathy, is surely the more reliable.

As regards the literary lineage of Shelley, he is an original guide. He considers him as a further development of Crashaw. From his theory that Shelley derives unconsciously from the Metaphysical School of poets many may differ, but he who formed himself on its models, who can most keenly sense its faint traces, can best follow the trail to the goal. His view accounts for certain peculiar features of the poems hitherto supposed to be a thing apart and unrelated—their dazzling fancies and visualized abstractions—by regarding them as a recrudescence of the lucent imagery of seventeenth-century poetry which had degenerated into the artificial conceits and frigid mannerisms of the eighteenth. Of the latter Collins alone has the spontaneity of the previous poets and connects with Shelley: in him there is “no lingering trace of powder from the eighteenth-century periwig, dimming the bright locks of poetry.” To detect these affinities Thompson was singularly gifted. A life-long disciple of Crashaw, he has all his mystic fervor and purple pomp of language. Shelley he resembles in his cult of beauty, his pictorial quality, his subtle vision and aerial imagery.

Shelley's character, which issued in acts so diverse and conflicting, is also here set in its proper light. When we remember, on the one hand, his absorption in things of the intellect, his quick sensibility to suffering and wrong, his lofty idealism, his pantheism; and, on the other, his revolutionary zeal, his ethical anarchy, his free love, his atheism, we can well understand how to many he seemed some wilful changeling. We recall Trelawney's open amazement, at their first meeting, that so shy and ingenuous a stripling could have drawn on himself the thunders

of authority. Browning largely solves the problem by his theory that Shelley was a visionary with a fatal proclivity for realizing his dreams. Full allowance, too, must be made for the vicious influence of Godwin's political and ethical doctrines in determining his conduct. Browning touches the central virtue of Shelley's life when he says that "what he acted corresponded to what he knew." Similarly Thompson recognizes that at worst he was but "a straying spirit of light," that his gravest faults were sometimes misdirected virtue. Even his flagrant crime, his desertion of his first wife, Harriet Westbrook, for Mary Godwin, was due rather to a darkening of the mind than to a depravity of the heart. It is referable to "no mere straying of the sensual appetite, but a straying strange and deplorable of the spirit." However, as his character matured and deepened through experience of life, Shelley was gradually shedding the wild growths of his nature. His latest poems, *e. g.*, the famous chorus from "Hellas," breathe a spirit far different from that of "Queen Mab," and show that his passion for the true, the good, and the beautiful was fast finding its home in the ideals of Christianity.

All the devious wanderings of Shelley's spirit seem to Thompson the froward ways of a child. His poetry, which is "the sincere effluence of his life," confirms this view. Until now it has been the custom to regard him as something elemental—a creature of fire and air and dew,

"Pinnacled dim in the intense inane"

who had nothing in common with ordinary mortals. His nature poems seemed the ethereal fancies of an Ariel, or the raptures of a nympholept too tenuous for human senses. To Matthew Arnold he was a beautiful but ineffectual angel, beating in the void his luminous wings in vain. It is idle to seek the clue in regions so alien and remote when it lies at hand within the familiar circle of human sympathies. Thompson, with kindred vision, sees everywhere in Shelley's poetry but "the winsome face of a child," in the bright speed of his lyrics a child's glee at the beauty and wonder of life. He recalls his own Mercury, the child of Heaven, who

“with winged feet  
Runs down the slanted sunlight of the dawn.”

Set the child in space amid the constellations and forces of Nature, and such radiant fancies result as throng together in “The Cloud” and “Prometheus Unbound.” His faculty of make-believe accounts for the mythopoeic element in the poems. The Wild West Wind will be felt as a breathing presence, and the tender flowers in “The Sensitive Plant” become like Hyacinthus and Narcissus, beautiful creatures with individual loves and natures. Nay, we cannot help thinking that his deepest affinities with those immoral children, the Greeks, best explain Shelley’s erring life. Their beautiful myths he refined into delicate forms of filmy iridescence—fragile shapes which tremble into being and evanesce with a quickening of hues. He had caught faint echoes of Pan’s music, and he piped on his gracile reed ravishing strains “of linked sweetness long-drawn out.” He was, as it were, some young pagan who lingered on into this grey, older world of ours for which his simple creed did not suffice. His anarchy was the blind revolt of a child, who will not be deceived, against empty shows and forms, hollow conventions nothing worth. His sorrows were like a child’s stormy grief, without horizon, because they were without Christian hope. His Platonic ethics led to his quest for Ideal Beauty in deplorable strange loves. As Thompson exquisitely phrases it, even “his dying seems a myth, a figure of his living: the material shipwreck a figure of the immaterial.”

Shelley is the poet of Nature rather than of Man. He is at best “a child with the whole outer universe for his box of toys.” The invocation in “Alastor” describes the province of his poetry:

“I wait thy breath, Great Parent; that my strain  
May modulate with murmurs of the air,  
And motions of the forest and the sea,  
And voice of living beings, and woven hymns  
Of night and day.”

When all is said, we must except “the deep heart of man” from his domain. From this his eager idealism, his inexperi-

ence, and aloofness from life debarred him. In his cult of Nature he differs from Thompson as a pagan mystic differs from a Catholic mystic. For to Thompson Nature is a visible manifestation of God. "The Supreme Spirit, creating, reveals His conceptions to man in the material forms of Nature. . . . Earthly beauty is but heavenly beauty taking to itself flesh." This world-concept marks all the difference of spirit between the "Ode to the Setting Sun" and "The Hymn of Apollo." It explains also how "not Shelley, not Wordsworth himself ever drew so close to the heart of Nature as did the Seraph of Assissi, who was close to the Heart of God." And like St. Francis, Francis Thompson learned to see through the lamp Beauty, the light, God. In human life, as in nature, beauty is, to him, never merely physical, but an emanation of heavenly imperishable beauty. It is rather the moral beauty incarnated in, and showing through, the fair physical vesture which is the object of his affection. So in "Love in Dia's Lap" he sings of his ideal lady:

" Her soul from earth to heaven lies  
 Like the ladder of the vision,  
                   Whereon go  
                   To and fro  
 In ascension and demission  
 Star-flecked feet of Paradise."

Thus the lady of his affections is the medium by which his human love is caught up into spiritual realms, and translated into a divine aspiration. Like, yet Oh, how different! is this spiritual passion of ideal love in "Her Portrait" and that of Shelley's "Epipsychidion." And how far removed are both poets from "love's sad satiety" of Swinburne!

Another facet of Shelley's genius remains to be considered. Harmonious and limpid as his prose was, it cannot compare with his poetry, and Thompson's judgment, which is at one with that of Mr. Clutton-Brock, decides the question of their relative merits forever. Yet it cannot be neglected in an estimate of the man. For his poetic creed we must turn to "The Defence of Poetry"; for his ethical gospel to the exquisite translation



of Plato's "Symposium." More important than these as revelations of his personality are his letters. Written mostly from Italy, and bathed in all the radiance of southern sunshine, they picture intimately the idyllic life of the poet and his circle amid scenes of classic beauty. If private letters are the immediate reflex of character, then surely their uniform elevation of tone, their unfailing kindness, and utter sincerity, confirm our view of Shelley's better self. In their passionate medium the dead facts of his biography take on warmth and colour, and become instinct with life. So we have seen some white Alpine peak, cold and silent on the horizon, glow warm beneath the reddening dawn.

Much of Francis Thompson's own story may be read between the lines of his essay. The last of the literary Bohemians to continue the traditions of Grub Street, it was meet that his work should be rejected only to be published later as the crowning glory of his life. He is of the company of Mangan who sought to still the gnawing pain of life by snatching a fearful joy. Like him he sought a means of escape from all the ills of mortality to realms

"Where seven-quiured psalterings meet;  
And all the gods move with calm hand in hand,  
And, eyes that know not trouble and the worm."

If the writing at times hints darkly at this dumb misery, his deathless passion for beauty—spiritual beauty shining through the shows of sense which are but broken lights of it—is writ large on every page. Over its rush of silver phrases, its careless music, the reader will linger long to savour all their charm. The appeal of childhood, and innocence, and religion will especially be felt. The author of "Her Portrait" cannot, with all his loving insight, condone Shelley's irregular unions; the poet of "The Hound of Heaven" surely lays his hand on the defect of "Adonais"—its lack of Christian hope. That his shining qualities should meet with recognition, however tardy, was inevitable. Now that his poems are ringing in the ears of the world, assurance is not lacking that they "will not fade on the winds, a cadence soon forgotten."

FLORENCE MOYNIHAN.

## PELAGIANISM IN IRELAND.

---

We know from trustworthy authorities that Pelagianism took root in the early British Church. On its account, St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, made two visits to England; first with Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, in 429 A. D., and afterwards with Severus, Bishop of Treves, A. D. 447. The Venerable Bede tells us that the first time the heresy made its appearance, the orthodox Christians sent representatives to Gaul "craving aid of the Gallican Bishops in that spiritual war."<sup>1</sup> In a council held at Troyes, it was decided that Germanus and Lupus should be the champions of the true faith across the Channel, and the sanction of the Pope was obtained through the instrumentality of Palladius.<sup>2</sup> According to the Scholiast on Fiace, St. Patrick accompanied the Bishop of Auxerre during his successful mission; it is probable also that Palladius lent a helping hand.

That there were Christians in Ireland before the arrival of Palladius is now generally accepted. It is argued from this fact, and Professor Bury thinks it probable though not proven, that Ireland presented a parallel case in England; namely, that she, like her sister isle was tainted with Pelagianism, and that the extirpation of this heresy was the object of Palladius' mission. The following is a summary of the arguments as given in Professor Bury's "Life of St. Patrick."<sup>3</sup> (1) Pope Celestine would not have sent a bishop to the Irish if they did not ask for one;<sup>4</sup> but a bishop was sent; hence the orthodox Christians must have applied for one to combat the Pelagian heresy existing among them. (2) Ireland, if there was Pela-

<sup>1</sup> Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, I, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> "Ad actionem Palladi." Prosper, Migne, *P. L.*, LI, p. 594.

<sup>3</sup> *Life of St. Patrick*, 51-54. By the way, this book has not received a very favourable criticism. Cf. Card. Moran: "Some Strictures on Professor Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*," *Irish Theol. Quart.*, April, 1907.

<sup>4</sup> "Nullus invitis detur episcopus." Celestine's *Ep.* IV., Migne, *P. L.*, I, p. 434.

gianism there, was dangerous to the Church of England, where Germanus was coping with the heresy; and this is why the question of sending a bishop to the Irish was at once practical and urgent. (3) Palladius was sent probably because he had taken a leading part in stamping out the error in England. (4) Possibly representatives of the Irish Christians may have intimated that they desired his appointment.

These arguments are certainly not convincing. Why should the Irish have asked for Palladius rather than for Germanus, Patrick or anyone else? Of course, it is possible, but many things are possible which are improbable. Bede explicitly tells us it was Germanus who took the leading part in crushing out Pelagianism in England; Palladius is not mentioned at all in this connection. Indeed it is only a probable opinion that he accompanied the Bishop of Auxerre to England. Why should it not be as likely that the Irish would ask for him who had been delegated by the council of Troyes, and who had done such good work in England? There is no reason why the Pope would refuse his consent, and, if it was an urgent case of heresy, as Professor Bury supposes, one would think that Germanus would receive orders to hasten to Ireland the moment he had successfully completed his English mission.

The decretal of Celestine—"nullus invitis detur episcopus," upon which Professor Bury builds up the theory that some overture or message had come from the Christian bodies in Ireland, the reason being the Pelagian difficulty, is explained by Cardinal Moran as follows: "St. Celestine's decretal has no reference to the case of Palladius, that is, to bishops who were destined to evangelize pagan nations. It was addressed to the Metropolitan of Gaul and it wisely ordains that on the vacancy of a see, the clergy of the widowed diocese should not be passed over, nor should a stranger be appointed their bishop without their approval."<sup>5</sup>

Would the Irish have interested Germanus, Palladius and Patrick only on the supposition that Pelagianism was rife among them? To suppose this is to suppose that their zeal

<sup>5</sup> Article cited above in *Irish Theol. Quart.*, April, 1907.

was at a low ebb and continued to one direction, and such is not the spirit manifested in St. Patrick's "Confession." While they were stamping out the heresy in England, they became acquainted with the conditions that existed in Ireland,<sup>6</sup> and came to the conclusion, that the cause of Christianity would be greatly furthered in that country by the sending of a bishop. This is all that is required to explain why, on their reporting the successful completion of their mission, Pope Celestine raised Palladius to the episcopate and sent him "to the Irish believing in Christ."

So that we fail to see why this conjecture, that it was on account of Pelagianism that Palladius was sent to Ireland, is at all probable. Professor Bury admits it is not proven. There is not the least hint in any documentary source known to us that favors such a conjecture; on the contrary, it is positively excluded by some reliable testimonials. St. Patrick, a staunch supporter of orthodoxy, who was in Ireland for six years as a slave, and for over sixty years as a bishop and apostle, never mentions having encountered this pernicious heresy against the Supernatural. In the early lives of St. Patrick<sup>7</sup> and in many of the Annals,<sup>8</sup> we find various reasons assigned for the sending of Palladius, but we never find the one conjectured by Zimmer,<sup>9</sup> and approved by Bury.

\* Card. Moran, *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, p. 40, Dublin, 1864, says a son of an Irish prince received the light of faith from Germanus in Britain, 429, and returning to his native land converted many of his friends and relatives. (*Acta SS. May*, tome I, p. 259.)

<sup>7</sup> Muirchu (writing about 690), says Palladius was sent to convert the island. *Vita Secunda*. Pope Celestine "sent him into the island of Hibernia." *Vita Quarta* (7th century, Palladius "was sent to preach the faith in Ireland." *The Tripartite Life*, (before 800), "to instruct the Irish." *Ussher's Latin Tripartite Life*, "to convert the Irish to Christ." *His Irish Life*, "to preach to the Irish." The British Nennius (8th century), "to convert the island to Christ." Marianus Scotus (born in Ulster, 1028), "to the Irish believing in Christ."

<sup>8</sup> *Annals of Ulster* and the *Annals of Innisfallen* have, Palladius is sent to the Irish "that they might believe in Christ." The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, "Palladius was sent . . . that he might confirm their faith." *Annals of the Four Masters*, "Pope Celestine sent Palladius to Ireland to propagate the faith among the Irish."

<sup>9</sup> In his work, *Pelagius in Ireland*, Berlin, 1901.

One would expect Prosper to have first rate knowledge, and hence be an important witness. He was a contemporary of Patrick and Palladius, was himself engaged in the Pelagian controversy, and afterwards became secretary to Pope Leo the Great. While he states that Germanus went to Britain to oppose the Pelagian heresy there rampant, he also testifies that "Palladius was consecrated by Pope Celestine, and sent as the first bishop to the Irish believing in Christ."<sup>10</sup> The phrase, "To the Irish believing in Christ," does not furnish any evidence for Pelagianism. Again in a eulogy on Celestine he compares what he accomplished in Ireland with his work in England. "Whilst that pope," he says, "labored to keep the Roman island (Britain) Catholic, he caused also the barbarous island to be gathered to the fold of Christ, by ordaining a bishop for the Irish."<sup>11</sup> There is a certain comparison or contrast here, and it is clearly evident that, so far as Prosper's knowledge went, there was no Pelagianism in what he calls "the barbarous island." If it existed there, and especially if Palladius was sent thither for the purpose of extirpating it, Prosper would never have written this statement.

The Venerable Bede (672-735), describes two successful crusades which Germanus preached against the Pelagian heresy in England, yet as regards the Pelagian mission in Ireland he says: "Palladius was sent by Pope Celestine of the Roman Church, the first bishop to the Irish believing in Christ."<sup>12</sup> He seems to be quoting Prosper, but he had an opportunity of mentioning Pelagianism if it had existed; and when we consider that, later in his work, he does not connect Ireland with this heresy, on evidence not the strongest, as we shall see, it seems only fair to conclude, that Bede had no evidence whatsoever before him, going to show that Pelagianism had prevailed in Ireland in the pre-Patrician period.

<sup>10</sup> "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes, ordinatur a papa Celestino et primus episcopus mittitur," Migne, *P. L.*, LI, p. 595.

<sup>11</sup> "Ordinato Scotis episcopo dum Romanam insulam studet servare Catholicam, fecit etiam barbaram Christianam." *Contra Collatorem*, c. 41, Migne, *P. L.*, LI, p. 271.

<sup>12</sup> *Eccl. His.*, I, 13; v, 24.

Many who would not admit the existence of the Pelagian heresy in Ireland before the time of St. Patrick, contend that it was there after his time. The two reasons most frequently brought forward are: 1) the great use made by the Irish of the Pelagian Commentaries on St. Paul's epistles; 2) an explicit charge of Pelagianism in a letter from the Roman Clergy.

Up to the sixteenth century the Commentary of Pelagius was known only by short extracts found in the writings of St. Augustine and Marius Mercator. Erasmus thought he recognised it amongst the writings of St. Jerome. And he was right, for Professor Zimmer afterwards showed that the pseudo-Jerome, the pseudo-Primasius, and the Ambrosiaster are only recensions of the Pelagian Commentary,<sup>13</sup> the un mutilated original of which, he discovered in the mss. of St. Gall.<sup>14</sup> The great German scholar proved conclusively that this Commentary, widely circulated under false names, was known in Irish Churches and monasteries under its own name. A collection of Irish Canons,<sup>15</sup> dating about 700, besides quotations from Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Gregory Naz., Basil, Lactantius, Ambrose, Faustus, Eusebius, Martin, Gildas, has two quotations from Pelagius.<sup>16</sup> In the Book of Armagh, there are Prologues to all the Pauline Epistles which are named "Prologus Pilagii,"<sup>17</sup> and there is an "argumentum Pilagii" to several of the Epistles.<sup>18</sup> The Wurzburg ms., in its explanatory notes, some of which are in Latin and some in Irish, quotes Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Isidore and Hel. (which turns out to be the Ambrosiaster), and it has 949 explicit citations from Pelagius.<sup>19</sup> There are 203 evidences of the notes of Pelagius in the Vienna Codex, which was written at Ratisbon about 1067 by Marianus Scotus.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, 112-137; 200-212.

<sup>14</sup> *Idem.*, 219-450.

<sup>15</sup> *Die Irische Kanonensammlung*, xviii-xix.

<sup>16</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, 24.

<sup>17</sup> Irish mss. frequently have i for e, v. g. *benivolencia*.

<sup>18</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, 25-39.

<sup>19</sup> *Idem.*, 39-112.

<sup>20</sup> *Idem.*, 137-156.

From the frequent use of the Pelagian Commentary Professor Zimmer concludes that Pelagianism was prevalent in Ireland during the fifth and following centuries. The learned philologist overdrew his materials. He does not always fashion his theories according to the nuggets he discovered. Is the fact that the Irish quoted Pelagius, in itself a proof that they were tainted with his heretical doctrine? If so, you could charge them with professing some of Origen's strange views for they quoted him; and arguing in a similar manner you could say since they quoted Augustine, this fact proves that they held Augustine's doctrine on the necessity of grace, and hence were orthodox and un-orthodox at the same time.

If the Irish monks on the continent, who made use of the Commentary of Pelagius really held and taught his doctrines, it is very strange we have no trace of it, no account of their being taken to task for it, of their being brought before a tribunal of some kind. No one can object that these monks were not closely watched and criticised for what they said and did contrary to established customs. Again, it is worth noting that in the Commentary of pseudo-Primasius (Migne, *P. L.* LXVIII, 415-794), which Professor Zimmer shows to be a recension of the Pelagian Commentary and to be written by the aid of an Irish monk, all the texts hurtful to Catholic doctrine are carefully left out.<sup>21</sup> It is significant too that orthodox Fathers are quoted side by side with Pelagius. The orthodoxy of the Book of Armagh cannot be called into question, and the Irish Canons are strictly Catholic in tone. So that the prevalence of Pelagius' heretical doctrines in the Irish Church is far from being an explanation of the use of his commentary. On the contrary, such orthodox writers would not quote from the Commentary, if Pelagianism was prevalent and if it was known as a heresy; as, for example, since the condemnation of Mod-

<sup>21</sup> *Pelagius in Ireland*, 136-137. Cf. Turmel: *Pélage et le pélagianisme dans les Églises celtiques*, in *Annals de Bretagne*, 1902, xvii, p. 321. In this article Turmel adopts the views of Zimmer; that Pelagius was an Irishman, that Pelagianism was in Ireland even in the pre-Patrician period and continued there till the Norman invasion in the ninth century. Cf. *Revue Celtique*, 1902, xxiii, 94-95.

ernism, an orthodox writer would not quote the works of Tyrrell. From this consideration, H. Williams draws the conclusion that the only explanation of the fact that the Irish quoted Pelagius, is that since the name was a common one, they did not know that the Commentary belonged to the heretic but thought it belonged to some orthodox Pelagius. "Is it not possible that a Commentary, which in other places and in quite orthodox circles, whether slightly revised or not could have been ascribed to Pope Gelasius,<sup>22</sup> or to Jerome, or to Primasius, should be regarded by the compilers of the books named as the work of some orthodox Pelagius?"<sup>23</sup>

Another explanation that has been advanced is that the Irish held in esteem and quoted the Pelagius' Commentary because he was of their own race, and they wished to have him considered as one of the great Fathers. However plausible this appears, the weight of authority favors the view that he was a Briton;<sup>24</sup> at least, it is not yet proven that he was an Irishman.

Is there anything in the Commentary itself, that could explain its use? At that time, as Gougaud points out, the choice of Commentaries was very limited and a good, succinct Commentary on the whole series of St. Paul's Epistles was very much to be desired.<sup>25</sup> The Pelagian Commentary was such a one. To quote H. Williams: "The work certainly has real merits that made it attractive, and a certain crisp conciseness which occasionally reminds one of Bengel, so that it became popular, let us say, not because it was the work of Pelagius, but in spite of the prejudice attaching to his name as a heresiarch."<sup>26</sup> That it was well worth quoting, well worth preserving, is confirmed by the fact that it was known and used all over the Christian world under the name of pseudo-Jerome,

<sup>22</sup> The pseudo-Primasius was generally ascribed to Pope Gelasius as Casiodorus testifies.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. "Heinrich Zimmer on the History of the Celtic Church," in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 1903, IV, 537.

<sup>24</sup> *Idem*, pp. 531-534.

<sup>25</sup> Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés celtiques*. Paris, 1911, p. 283.

<sup>26</sup> Art. in *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, p. 536.



pseudo-Primasius, the Ambrosiaster, so that at the very least, we can conclude with the last mentioned author, that the facts accumulated by Professor Zimmer, if not indeed adverse to his theory, do not support it.<sup>27</sup>

A letter written by the Pope elect John IV to the Bishops and clergy, mostly of the North of Ireland, charges them with the Pelagian heresy; and on the strength of the evidence of this letter, such men as Dr. Lanigan and Archbishop Healy, not to mention Zimmer and Turmel, say that, in the seventh century, there was in Ireland a certain amount of Pelagianism.<sup>28</sup> All that we have of this letter is what is preserved by Bede.<sup>29</sup>

"Likewise John, who succeeded Severinus, successor to the same Honorius, being yet but Pope elect, sent to them (the Irish) letters of great authority for correcting the same error, clearly showing, that Easter Sunday is to be found between the fifteenth moon and the twenty-first, as was proved in the Council of Nice. In the same epistle he also admonished them to be careful to crush out the Pelagian heresy, which he had been informed was reviving among them. The beginning of the epistle was as follows: 'To our most beloved and most holy Tomianus, Columbanus, Cromanus, Dimanus, and Balthanus, bishops: to Cromanus, Hernianus, Laestranus, Scellanus, and Segenus, priests; to Saranus, and the rest of the Scottish doctors, or abbots, health from Hilarius the archpriest, and keeper of the place of the Apostolic See; John the deacon, and elect in the name of God; from John the chief secretary and keeper of the place of the holy Apostolic See, and from John the servant of God, and counsellor of the same Apostolic See. The writings which were brought by the bearer to Pope Severinus, of holy memory, were left at his death, without an answer to the things contained in them. Lest such intri-

<sup>27</sup> *Idem*, p. 531.

<sup>28</sup> Father D'Alton writes: "neither in St. Patrick's time nor subsequently has it been proved that Pelagianism established itself in Ireland," in his *History of Ireland*, half vol. I, p. 86. London, 1912.

<sup>29</sup> *Eccles. Hist.*, II, p. 19. Translation by Giles, London, 1892; when necessary I shall quote Latin original edited by Plummer, Oxford, 1896.

cate questions should remain unresolved, we have opened the same, and found that some in your province, endeavouring to revive a new heresy, out of an old one, contrary to the orthodox faith, do through ignorance reject our Easter when Christ was sacrificed; and contend that the same should be kept on the fourteenth moon with the Hebrews.' . . . .

"By the beginning of the epistle it evidently appears that this heresy sprang up among them, of very late times, and that not all their nation, but only some of them, had fallen into the same. After having laid down the manner of keeping Easter, they add this, concerning the Pelagians, in the same epistle. 'And we have also understood that the poison of the Pelagian heresy again springs up among you; we, therefore, exhort you, that you put away from your thoughts all such venomous and superstitious wickedness. For you cannot be ignorant how that execrable heresy has been condemned; for it has not only been abolished these two hundred years, but it is also daily anathematized forever by us; and we exhort you, now that the weapons of this controversy have been burnt, not to rake up the ashes. For who will not detest that insolent and impious proposition—that man can live without sin, of his own free will, and not through the grace of God. . . .'"

In the first place what is the meaning of "And we have also understood that the poison of the Pelagian heresy again springs up among you."<sup>30</sup> "Again springs up (*denuo revivescit*)," as Dr. Lanigan rightly remarks, does not mean that it existed of old in Ireland, but that, having been crushed everywhere, it was beginning to be received."<sup>31</sup> This meaning is confirmed by what is said later, namely: "we exhort, now that the weapons (of their controversy) have been burnt, that the ashes be not raked up among you."<sup>32</sup> Notice, he does not say "now that the weapons have been burnt amongst you"; he simply continues the thought in the beginning of this same sentence:

"*Et hoc quoque cognovimus quod virus Pelagianae hereseos apud vos denuo revivescit.*"

<sup>30</sup> *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, II, p. 415.

<sup>32</sup> "*Hortamur ne quorum arma combusta sunt, apud vos eorum cineres suscitentur.*"

"for it has not only been abolished these two hundred years"—referring evidently to the abolition of the heresy, over two hundred years before, in Carthage and Rome. The context therefore shows that the words, "again springs up among you," does not mean that the heresy had been there previously. And this context "do not rake up the ashes," or, literally, "let not the ashes be raked up among you," implies that, as far as the writer knew, the heresy was not in Ireland to any extent, and certainly had not yet secured a foothold there. He does not say, "we have understood that the poison of the Pelagian heresy has revived among you," but "revives," or, "is reviving." The same expression is used by Bede in introducing the letter: "the heresy which, he had been informed, was reviving among them."<sup>33</sup>

How did the Pope-elect get his information? He states in the letter: "The writings which were brought by the bearers to Pope Severinus of holy memory were left at his death, without an answer to the things contained in them. Lest such intricate questions should remain unresolved we opened the same and found . . . and we have also understood."<sup>34</sup> We do not know who the informants were, nor can we decide, from the evidence before us, whether the reports of the two heresies, Quartodeciman and Pelagian, came in one or in separate letters.

The matter does not seem to be taken very seriously by John IV. He is surprised at it, for he says, "you cannot be ignorant how that execrable heresy has been condemned." He gives a moral exhortation, but it ends there. He does not even write a letter for the special purpose of condemning their Pelagianism, as Bede expressly states: "he also in the same epistle admonishes them"; and again: "having laid down the manner of celebrating Easter, they add this concerning the Pelagians, in the same epistle." So that these remarks on Pelagianism are not the primary object of the letter, but only an addition.

<sup>33</sup> "Pelagiana heresi quem apud eos revivescere didicerat."

<sup>34</sup> "We have understood" (*cognovimus*) in the second part corresponds with "we found" (*reperimus*) in the first part of the letter.

The whole evidence, then, furnished by the letter of the Roman Clergy amounts to this, that John IV found something, in letters sent to his predecessor, from which he gathered that the Pelagian heresy was reviving or starting in Ireland. This is the most that can be inferred. And even this is based on a report which must first be shown to have had a foundation in fact, before one may justly use it as an absolute proof.

Not only this, but we think there is sufficient reason for rejecting as unreliable the information that prompted the letter, as it is false in one point. The charge of Quartodeciman heresy is certainly unfounded. There is no evidence whatsoever that the Irish celebrated Easter on any day except on Sunday, or that they celebrated on the fourteenth of the moon, unless it fell on Sunday.<sup>35</sup> Bede himself informs us that the Irish always commemorated the Resurrection on the Lord's Day.<sup>36</sup> Hence when he reads this charge in the Roman letter, he says: "By the Beginning of the epistle, it evidently appears that the heresy sprang up among them *of very late times* and that not all their nation, but only some of them had fallen into it." If he had any other evidence of its truth, he would have brought it forward. Likewise, as regards the charge of Pelagianism, he does not produce any other evidence. If, then, we reject the charge in the first part of the letter, why should we be asked to accept the charge in the second part?

From the evidence of this letter, Dr. Lanigan admits that there was Pelagianism in Ireland, but only to a very limited degree. "This truly execrable heresy," he says, "did not begin to make its appearance in Ireland until a short time before the Roman letter was written. Ireland was not infected with any such heresy in the days of St. Columbanus; nor does Pelagianism seem to have made any progress there, or to have given rise to even one congregation separated from the Catholic Church. The most that can be allowed is, that, although there was no Pelagian sect in this country, there were some

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Healy's *Papers and Addresses*, p. 228, also *Early Irish Church*, p. 50; Smith, Appendix to Bede, no. ix; Plummer, *Opera Bedae*, vol. II, p. 348; Williams, article cited above, in *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, 1903, IV, p. 537.

<sup>36</sup> *Eccles. Hist.*, III, p. 4, also III, p. 27.

theologians who, in discussing the important questions relative to Grace and free will, were more inclined to favor the latter than the former; and, as has been too much the case with many divines of later times, intermingled certain Pelagian principles or embers with the doctrine of the Gospel.”<sup>37</sup>

Archbishop Healy asserts: “in face of the emphatic statement of the Roman authorities—we know this too—it cannot, we think, be denied that there must have been at that time in the country, some remnants of Pelagianism, derived in all probability from the neighboring and friendly British churches.”<sup>38</sup> His Grace calls the statement made in the first part of the Roman letter—that the Irish were Quartodeciman, “a charge certainly unfounded.”<sup>39</sup> On what grounds, then, one may ask, does he accept the charge in the second part? He gives it, as his opinion, that the Irish, in all probability, derived their Pelagianism from the friendly British churches. Only a few pages earlier<sup>40</sup> in his article he admits that, “we have no positive proof of any kind that at this early period (namely, before the date of the Roman letter), the taint of Pelagianism extended from Wales to Ireland.” It is not only not proven, but there is against it the strong presumption of an anti-Pelagian spirit, which St. Patrick must have instilled into the Irish,<sup>41</sup> and there is also against it the thirty-second canon of the first Patrician synod, which shows that the Irish were on their guard against British clerics.<sup>42</sup> Again, if the heresy came from Britain to Ireland, it must have come before the year 529 A. D., for in that year at the Council of Caerleon it received its *coup de grace* in England.<sup>43</sup> It was a hundred and eleven years afterwards, namely in 640, that the Roman

<sup>37</sup> *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, II, p. 410.

<sup>38</sup> *Papers and Addresses*, p. 229.

<sup>39</sup> *Papers and Addresses*, p. 228.

<sup>40</sup> *Papers and Addresses*, p. 227.

<sup>41</sup> “It is not likely,” says Archbishop Healy, “that he, the pupil and companion of the great Germanus, would tolerate its introduction into Ireland during all the long and fruitful years of his Irish Apostolate.” *Papers and Addresses*, p. 228.

<sup>42</sup> “Clericus que de Brittanis ad nos venit sine epistola, etsi habitet in lebe, non licitum ministrare.”

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Healy, *Papers and Addresses*, p. 227.

letter was written, and the words of the letter "revives among you" is far from implying that the heresy had been there all this time. Nor is it easy to understand how Pelagianism could have remained concealed in Ireland for a hundred and eleven years. We know the reception it got in Carthage and Palestine, we know how active Prosper was against the Semi-pelagians in Gaul, we know how, every time the Pelagian heresy made its appearance in England, it was not allowed to live peacefully. Germanus was sent for, and synods were held until it was rooted out. How, then, could it have remained in Ireland so long without creating some noise, without leaving some trace?

It does not seem probable, as some scholars assert, that it was the South of Ireland that sent the reports to Rome concerning the heresies in the North. This supposes that the Pelagian heresy had spread to such an extent in the North as to attract the attention of the South, which has not in its favor the context of the Roman letter, and has against it the absence of all other traces of the heresy. It also supposes great ignorance or malice on the part of the South. Since it was only a few years previously that the Southerners had adopted the Roman way of computing Easter, one can hardly conceive how they could charge their Northern brethren with being Quarto-decimans. Nor does it seem at all probable that the North of Ireland would charge itself with these heresies—the letter quoted by Bede does not say "we understood from you." From the ignorance or malice displayed, does it not seem more probable that the information came from some foreigner sojourning in Ireland?<sup>44</sup> We know that during this period there were

"This view that the reports which prompted the Roman letter had no foundation in fact, and were probably occasioned by the use of the Pelagian Commentary, is held by Gougaud: "Il est bien possible que le seul fait de se servir du Commentaire de l'hérésiarque pour étudier saint Paul ait donné naissance aux bruits qui parvinrent aux oreilles du pape." (*Les Chrétientés Celtiques*, p. 284); also by Williams, "one is strongly tempted to say that a mistake had been made at Rome, . . . At Rome they were keen enough to fasten on the name 'Pelagius' whose Commentary the Irish were in the habit of quoting, naturally concluding that there must be in this a sign of the recent revival of an ancient heresy." (*Art. Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, 1903, iv, p. 538.)

many foreigners in Ireland; Bede incidentally tells us, that when the plague occurred in A. D. 664, "many of the nobility and of the lower ranks of the English nation were there at that time, who, in the days of the bishops Finan and Colman, forsaking their native island retired thither, either for the sake of divine studies, or of a more continent life."<sup>45</sup> The explanation that suggests itself is, that some foreigner, not fully acquainted with the true condition of affairs, wrote to Rome, charging the Irish with the Quartodeciman heresy. He may have been led to believe this from the fact that the Irish did celebrate Easter on the fourteenth of the moon, when it fell on Sunday; and also that they claimed St. John as an authority for this cycle. Likewise, this or some other foreign visitor may have charged the Irish with reviving the Pelagian heresy, and this may have been suggested to him by the fact that they made great use of the Pelagian Commentary. At any rate, no matter who sent the report, it does not necessarily follow that it was founded on correct observation. So that this letter from John IV does not furnish a solid argument to prove that Pelagianism had taken root in Ireland, as it only asserts that the heresy was starting, was in its incipient stage, so to speak, and furthermore, because the letter quotes rumor, and is not a statement of ascertained fact.

During this very period, when the Pelagian Commentary was in great use, and the charge in the Roman letter was made, we find evidences of the orthodoxy of the Irish. In their liturgical books written in the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries, there are expressions<sup>46</sup> which witness to their belief in the necessity of grace.

<sup>45</sup> *Eccl. Hist.*, III, p. 27, also III, p. 4.

<sup>46</sup> For example: the Book of Dimma (middle of 7th cent.), "ut quod per meritum non meretur, misericordiae gratia consequatur orantibus nobis." The Antiphony of Bangor (written 680-691), "Christi Dei gratiam supplices obsecramus." Stowe Missal (about 9th cent.), in its "Ordo Baptismi" has "Deus qui Adam de limo terrae fecisti et ille in Paradiso peccavit et illum peccatum mortis non reputasti . . . quia Deus et Dominus noster ad suam sanctam gratiam atque misericordiam baptismi vocare digneris." St. Gall ms. 1395 (8th or 9th cent.) "divinae gratiae sumat effectus." My authority is Warren, "The Liturgy and Ritual of the

In a letter to Pope Boniface (612), St. Columbanus boasted that his church was not schismatical or heretical, nor held anything outside the evangelical and apostolic doctrine but the Catholic faith, as it was first preached to them.<sup>47</sup> Wilfrid, whose hostility to the Celtic Church was notorious, in a council at Rome, A. D. 680, asserted that the true Catholic faith was held by the Irish, Scottish and British, as well as by the Anglo-Saxon Church.<sup>48</sup> These emphatic statements, one made twenty-eight years before, the other forty years after, the date of the Roman letter, positively exclude the opinion that Pelagianism flourished in Ireland, at least to any great extent. The question whether the heresy manifested itself in one or two localities, is a difficult one; it may be settled by a thorough investigation of the many Irish mss.; as yet there is no convincing evidence to allow one to adopt the affirmative.

On account of the suspicion of heresy, under which he and his countrymen were held, St. Mochta of Louth, during a visit to Rome about 460 A. D., drew up a profession of faith, and offered it to the reigning Pontiff. In this formula, he more than once refers to the fact of one individual having given the evil fame of heresy to his country, which he complains of as unfair and unjust.<sup>49</sup> Whether this individual whom he refers

Celtic Church." Oxford, 1881. H. Williams, in article above cited (*Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, 1903, IV, p. 538), writes: "The earliest Irish literature, following the date of the Roman Letter (A. D. 640), as has been already remarked, shows not the faintest trace of Pelagianism; in the Epistles of Columbanus I can find no mention of Pelagius; no saying of Columba, as recorded in the Life of Adamnan, refers to the heresy." Turmel (*l. c.*, p. 319, note) tries to answer the argument from the orthodoxy of the Columbanus by saying that he was some years on the continent when he wrote.

"Nihil extra Evangelicam et Apostolicam doctrinam recipientes; nullus haereticus nullus Judaeus, nullus schismaticus fuit, sed fides Catholica sicut a vobis primum, sanctorum scilicet Apostolorum successoribus tradita est, inconcussa tenetur. . . Ep. v ad Bonif., Migne, *P. L.*, LXXX, p. 275.

"Pro omni Aquiloni parte Brittanniae et Hiberniae insulisque quae ab Anglorum et Britorum necnon Scotorum et Pictorum gentibus colebantur, veram et catholicam fidem confessus est, et cum subscriptione sua corroboravit." Eddius Vit. Wilfrid c. LI.

"If for the fault of one individual," he says, "the inhabitants of the whole country are to be deemed accursed, let that most blessed dis-



to—and who no doubt is the one mentioned by Jerome as of Irish descent—be Pelagius or Coelestius, is of no importance here;<sup>50</sup> even if Pelagius and Coelestius were born in Ireland, on this account alone it could be argued that the mother country must be tainted with the heresy of her sons, as it was Rufinus of Syria who was the original author of Pelagianism, and it was in Rome that Pelagius and Coelestius first announced their heretical doctrines. Cardinal Moran rightly remarks, St. Mochta “thus gives us the key to the statements of early writers concerning the faith of our island in the fifth century.”<sup>51</sup> The fact that one of the chief propagators of Pelagianism was of Irish descent, caused many to attribute the heresy to Ireland. Then as Patrick and Palladius, before going to Ireland, had taken part in rooting out Pelagianism in England; also as England and Ireland were, for a time, one in error in regard to the celebration of Easter, many were easily led to unite the two countries, when treating of Pelagianism. A tract on the various liturgies, probably written by an Irish monk on the Continent, states that Germanus and Lupus preached in Britain and in Ireland, implying that Ireland too was infected with the Pelagian heresy.<sup>52</sup> In a statement of Prosper that, “in the consulate of Florentius and Dionysius, Agricola a Pelagian, son of Severian a Pelagian, corrupted by his teaching the churches of England”;<sup>53</sup> a few

ciple too, be condemned, I mean Rome itself.” Translation—Moran, *Essays*, etc., p. 94.

<sup>50</sup> The words of Jerome, “progenies Scoticae” (Migne, *P. L.*, xxiv, 758), according to Professor Zimmer, refer to Pelagius and therefore he was an Irishman “coming from a Christian monastery in the southeast of Ireland.” (*Pelagius in Ireland*, pp. 18-19). Archbishop Healy likewise holds that these words refer to Pelagius, but only mean that he was of Irish descent, Coelestius, he says, was probably a Gaul or an Italian. (*Papers and Addresses*, p. 219). H. Williams very conclusively, it seems to me, proves from the context of the passage and from the mind of Jerome that he intended these words for Coelestius. (Art. in *Zeit. Celt. Phil.*, pp. 531-534.) That Coelestius was meant and not Pelagius, is also held by Card. Moran (*Essays on the Irish Church*, p. 94) and by B. MacCarthy in an article by Professor Zimmer on “Early Irish History,” in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1903, xiv, p. 2.

<sup>51</sup> *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, p. 297.

<sup>52</sup> Moran, *Essays on Early Irish Church*, p. 243.

<sup>53</sup> Migne, *P. L.*, li, p. 594.

inferior manuscripts inserted "Hiberniae" (Ireland) instead of "Brittaniae" (England). The Annals of Clonmacnoise, compiled in the twelfth century, have this curious notation opposite the year 455 A. D.: "The Resurrection of Our Lord was celebrated the 8th of the Kalends of May by the Pelagian heresy."<sup>54</sup> The use of the Pelagian Commentary, and above all the charge in the Roman letter, did much to confirm the suspicious, and to spread the evil report. It was natural that additions should be made. The climax was reached when the author of the life of St. Killian, the Apostle of Franconia, declared that, on account of Pelagianism, Ireland lay under Apostolic censure, from which it was necessary to get absolution in Rome.<sup>55</sup>

To make a charge is one thing, to substantiate it another. The charge that Ireland was Pelagian, is not only without foundation; it is positively excluded by trustworthy testimonies.

#### WORKS CONSULTED:

- BEDE, VENER.: *Ecclesiastical History*. Ed. Giles, J. A. London, 1892.
- Baedae *Opera Historica*. Ed. Plumer, C. Oxford, 1896.
- BURY, J. B.: *The Life of St. Patrick and his Place in History*. London, 1905.
- D'ALTON, REV. E. A.: *History of Ireland*. Half vol. I, p. 86. London, 1912.
- GOUGAUD, DON LOUIS: *Les Chrétientés Celtiques*. Paris, 1911.
- HEALY, ARCHBISHOP: *Papers and Addresses*. Dublin, 1909.
- The Ancient Irish Church*. London, 1892.
- The Life and Writings of St. Patrick*. Dublin, 1905.

<sup>54</sup> Is "Pelagian" written by mistake for "Quartodeciman?"

<sup>55</sup> "Hibernia olim Pelagiana foedata fuerit heresi; Apostolicaque censura damnata quae nisi Romano judicio solvi non potest." Archbishop Healy says concerning this, "The writer of this life is unknown. . . . It seems the writer knew something of the letter from Rome in 640 to which we have already referred and in all probability the Apostolic censure of which he spoke is the rebuke contained in that letter." *Papers and Addresses*, p. 229.

- MACCARTHY, B.: Professor Zimmer on "Early Irish History," in *The Irish Eccl. Record*, 1903, xiv, 2; also his introduction in vol. vi, *Annals of Ulster*, Dublin, 1901.
- MORAN, CARDINAL: *Essays on the Early Irish Church*. Dublin, 1864.
- "Some Strictures on Professor Bury's Life of St. Patrick," *Irish Theol. Quart.*, April, 1907.
- SCHAEFER: "St. Patrick and Palladius," in the *Catholic University Bulletin*, 1, 1895.
- STOKES, G. T.: *Ireland and the Celtic Church*. London, 1886.
- TURMEL, J.: "Pélage et le pélagianisme dans les Églises celtiques," in the *Annales de Bretagne*, 1902, xvii, p. 309-322; also *Revue Celtique*, 1902, xxiii, p. 94-95.
- WARREN: *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*. Oxford, 1881.
- WILLIAMS, H.: Heinrich Zimmer on the "History of the Celtic Church," in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 1903, iv, 528-574.
- ZIMMER, HEINRICH: *Pelagius in Ireland*. Berlin, 1901.

PATRICK J. TEMPLE.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**Bethléem,** Le Sanctuaire de la Nativité, par Pp. H. Vincent et F. M. Abel, O. P. Ouvrage publié avec le concours de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Libraire Lecoffre. J. Gabalda, Éditeur. Paris, 1914. 216 pages, 4to. 20 plates. Numerous smaller illustrations in the text.

**Jérusalem.** Recherches de Topographie, d'Archéologie et d'Histoire. Tome Second. Jérusalem Nouvelle par les Pp. Hugues Vincent et F. M. Abel des Frères Prêcheurs. Préface par M. le Marquis de Vogüé de l'Académie Française. Ouvrage publié avec le concours de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Paris, 1914. Librairie Victor Lecoffre. J. Gabalda, Éditeur. 419 pages, 4to. Double columns, 42 plates and plans. 160 illustrations.

The antecedents of these monographs were outlined on the appearance of "Jérusalem Antique," "fascicule I," whole No. 96 of the BULLETIN. Being the first syntheses of their kind, and from competent pens, they both merit the praise (bestowed on the latter by the Palestine Exploration Fund, England), as "splendid examples of French archæological and historical research." (Q. S., April, 1914.) The treatment is most exhaustive, while the subsidiary matter, texts in the original language, be it even in Greek or Arabic, and the critical notes, are so arranged as not to annoy or hinder the ordinary reader. The descriptions and arguments are admirably clear and intelligible.

Since almost the only American Catholic work that purports to deal expressly with the sanctuaries of Palestine, namely, "A Diary of My Life in the Holy Land" (Rochester, 1906), is eminently skeptical and subversive of the most sacred traditions, it is gratifying to have at our disposal the conclusions of scholars of acknowledged superiority in some more scientific form than that of current guide-books.

In topographical pursuits there are four milestones: documents, tradition, monuments and the actual condition of the sites. When these are all present and correctly aligned, a problem is considered

solved. Documents and traditions are old, but incomplete and insufficient to link the sanctuaries of today with the mysteries they commemorate. Moreover, they look much different after the sanctuaries have been visited and the monuments examined. For this reason the deposition of conscientious eye-witnesses is most precious. Without this, too much is apt to be taken for granted. On the other hand, it is not the superficial witness, nor the too credulous pilgrim, nor the student who reaches a variety of dissolving conclusions in the short space of nine months, who is competent to guide. Father Vincent has been an observer of what he narrates for almost 20 years; Father Abel, for over a decade. The former is an archæologist, the latter a historian—and the two confrères working conjointly as Catholic pioneers, are now giving out the results of their researches.

The Marquis de Vogüé in his preface to "Jérusalem" considers the work as "definitive" and as a new proof that the history of monuments is the best commentary on written traditions.

"Bethléem" is an accessory which with "Jérusalem," completes the study of the three ancient basilicas, erected by St. Helena. The nativity, the resurrection, the ascension—was the trilogy that resounded within their walls. The *Eleona* on Mt. Olivet is in ruins, but the *Anastasis* at Jerusalem and the basilica at Bethlehem survive. All three were of the Roman type with propylæa, atrium, a single apse, colonnades mounted by architraves, a raised choir, and a *martyrium*, or subterranean crypt, the altar of which corresponded in position to the apse above. At Bethlehem the *martyrium* was the grotto of the nativity; at Jerusalem, it was the cistern in which the true cross was found; on Mt. Olivet it was a grotto in which an ancient tradition maintained that Christ was wont to instruct His disciples.

Between the Holy Sepulchre and the Church of the Ascension lies Gethsemane which receives a due meed of attention. The history of each sanctuary is traced as nearly as may be from post-apostolic times to our own day. At the end of each treatise is a group of all-important texts serving as sources. The result is conviction and honesty discerned and imparted, and a confirmation of the authenticity of the sanctuaries arising from the study of them on a scientific basis.

Although the Bethlehem basilica is the best preserved, that of the Holy Sepulchre having undergone several restorations, never-

theless the most recent investigations, conducted by the Dominican authors themselves, have proved that the Bethlehem basilica too has been remodelled, the workmanship pointing unmistakably to the sixth century. These results were received benevolently by the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, in April, 1913, after a period of controversy in which a body of English critics had tried to uphold the Constantinian origin of the edifice in its present condition.

THOMAS à K. REILLY, O. P.

---

**Conférences de Saint-Étienne, 1909-10-11.** Paris. Librairie Victor Lecoffre. J. Gabalda, Éditeur. Two vols., 309 and 322 pages respectively.

**Une Croisière Autour de la Mer Morte,** par le P. F. M. Abel des Frères Prêcheurs. Paris. Librairie Victor Lecoffre. J. Gabalda, Éditeur. 188 pages.

These three volumes belong to the series "Études Palestiniennes et Orientales." The conferences are the continuation of a course of which Pope Leo XIII wrote in 1892: "Dilecto filio Josepho Mariæ Lagrange. . . . Nunc vero lætitia est nobis, audito rem ipsam, te Dilecte Fili, moderante, opemque sodalibus conferentibus, prospero ire cursu cœpisse, tum cultorum frequentia eorumque non ex hominibus tantum Sacri Ordinis, neque ex catholicis tantum, tum etiam bonis fructibus consecutis."

The range of subjects embraces history, archæology, geography and other phases of Orientalism. We may single out as typical "Les origines babyloniennes" and "Les Aryens avant Cyrus," by R. P. Dhorme; "Bonaparte en Syrie," by R. P. Génier; "A travers les papyrus grecs," and "À la recherche des sites bibliques," by R. P. Lagrange.

The "Croisière" furnishes a new and original description of the Dead Sea prepared by an eye witness under novel circumstances.

During the fortnight beginning December 28, 1908, the Dominican Biblical School organized and conducted to a successful issue the most thorough-going exploration of the sea and its indentations that has been possible in modern times. Father Abel publishes the story of the expedition with its results, interweaving

with it a critical review of allied medieval and ancient traditions, historic and Biblical problems, philological and topographical data—all which add to the interest of the sea, apart from the fact that its dangerous waters were for the first time being traversed by the 20 members of the caravan in a motor-boat which has since foundered. The book is richly illustrated and contains a map and alphabetical index.

THOMAS à K. REILLY, O. P.

---

**Saint Justin**, Philosophe, Martyr, par le P. M. J. Lagrange des Frères Prêcheurs. Paris, 1914. Librairie Victor Lecoffre. J. Gabalda, Éditeur. 240 pages.

This able contribution to the series "Les Saints" derives its chief merit from being a sympathetic study in perspective. Comparatively little is known of St. Justin apart from certain sparse details of his birth and conversion, his writings and martyrdom. Of extant works ascribed to him, only four are authentic, viz., two apologies, the Dialogue with Tryphon and fragments of treatises on the Resurrection. Yet the life was important in its day, as it is in ours. St. Justin was the inaugurator of scientific theology and, being an authoritative exponent of Christianity wherever he went, he stands in our knowledge as a symbol of Church unity, in Palestine, Asia Minor and Rome in the first half of the second century. Imbued with Platonism, he read into his philosophy much that religion had taught him, but both philosophy and religion impelled him towards God. He was a lay Apostle who judged himself a debtor to all, and in his apologies addressed to Jew and Pagan he seems intent on showing, not that the adversaries were wrong, but that Christianity was right. Negligent in style and composition, but frank, firm and independent in the assertion of truth, he pleads always as a man of heart—except when treating with heretics.

Father Lagrange has developed from his personal familiarity with Palestine and his acknowledged comprehension of the ideas and peoples that became inseparable from it in primitive Christian times, a philosophic and ethnological background, wrenched from which the life of St. Justin, its usefulness and its mistakes,

cannot be properly understood. His study of "*Messianisme chez les Juifs*," (Paris, 1909) has enabled him to appreciate the saint's attitude towards Tryphon with the clearness of a contemporary; while the many years he has devoted to Biblical theology lends special worth to his presentation of St. Justin's theology as centering about "the Word." The mistakes of St. Justin he traces, not to philosophical bias, not to a wavering faith nor to the subordination of faith to reason, but to unsound exegesis which he accounts for by the earliness of the period, by Biblical textual errors, and the yet unsystematized and embryonic stage of the art.

THOMAS àK. REILLY, O. P.

---

**Miss Agnès McLaren** du Tiers-Ordre de Saint-Dominique,  
Docteur en Médecine. Paris, 1914. Librairie Poussielgue.  
242 pages.

This interesting biography of an unusual personage has been written in a spirit of piety by the Master General of the Dominican Order. Miss Agnes was reared a Protestant. Her father, Duncan, was distinguished by his opposition to Gladstone on the matter of Home Rule, and his dislike for the policies of O'Connell. He stood for a "united" Britain, and among many other projects, labored for the encouragement of medical studies among women, and for the concession to females of the rights of suffrage. Worthy of such a father, Agnes appears as one of the first active and influential suffragettes, and in due time became a doctor of medicine, the first of her sex to be graduated by the French University of Montpellier. At Dublin she was licensed by the Royal College of Physicians, of which body she subsequently became a member and "socius."

Up to this time she had happened under the wholesome influence of Cardinals Newman, Manning and de Cabrières, but it was an humble priest of Lyons who was the instrument of her conversion. For twenty years, she spontaneously sought the direction of M. l'Abbé Perra, during retreats which she made annually. At the end of that period, thanks to her purity of life, her interest in the neighbor, her integrity of character and love of truth, her last misgiving towards the Church visible vanished.



As a Protestant she had been accustomed to hear Mass frequently, to observe the weekly abstinence, and to use the opportunities of the medical profession in behalf of the poor and chiefly for the uplift of souls. In the end, God's grace drew her to Catholicism, which she embraced November 30, 1898. Eight months later, when the Church and the poor had become a passion with her she was confirmed in the Dominican chapel of Bethany (France) at which place she received impressions which were to color her later career. In 1900 she became a tertiary of the Order of St. Dominic and five years later we find her embarking for India.

She had specialized in medicine for the express purpose of doing good to souls as Christ had done, by reaching them through the body. In India she looked for the highest realization of her hopes. With the blessings of Popes Leo XIII, Pius X and numerous prelates, she established an hospital at Rawal Pindi under the patronage of St. Catherine of Genoa, but she would do more. The need of pious women skilled in medicine for works of charity and conversion was sadly felt by Catholic missionaries, and Dr. McLaren had conceived the design of forming an association to meet it. Five visits to Rome between the years 1908 and 1912, for the sake of obtaining pontifical approval failed of success. Her last years were passed quietly at Antibes, France, where she died 7 April, 1913, aged 75 years.

The narrative is written and tastily illustrated by one whose keen appreciation of spiritual realities has enabled him to point out the finger of God directing this singular career and sanctifying this humble soul by constancy in suffering and by increased piety and hope in the midst of great disappointment.

THOMAS àK. REILLY, O. P.

---

**Revue Lacordaire**; Vol. I, 1913; Paris, P. Lethielleux. Pp. 416.  
Frs. 6.

This first volume of the quarterly *Revue Lacordaire* contains original articles, texts hitherto unpublished, letters written by or addressed to Lacordaire, documents, and bibliographical information. The intention of the editors is to prepare in this way a complete critical edition of Lacordaire's works. While the review

centres around the great Dominican, it has a much wider field of interest, for Lacordaire was a prominent figure among the great men of his time, and hence much is found in the *Revue* that is of primary importance to the student of one of the most interesting periods of Church History in France.

C. A. DUBRAY.

---

**The Human Soul**, and its relations with other spirits, by Dom Anscar Vonier, O. S. B., Abbot of Buckfast; St. Louis, B. Herder, 1913. Pp. viii + 368. \$1.50.

This work is a summary of the Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of the soul, its prerogatives both natural and supernatural, its origin and destiny, its union with the organism, its activities in the form of virtue and sin, and its reward or punishment after death. The author's views "are merely the views of the great Catholic philosophers and theologians." As "the book is meant essentially for the educated lay mind," and "its purpose is intellectual more than devotional," the writer has endeavored "to explain some of the philosophical truths of Scholasticism in as simple language as possible," and "is more intent on giving the spirit than the letter of Catholic philosophy."

Such a comprehensive study of the human soul cannot fail to be interesting and suggestive. The main difficulties inherent in the very nature of such a work have been overcome to a great extent, yet not with complete success. First, where philosophical and theological doctrines are presented together, there is danger of not drawing a sufficiently clear line between the knowledge derived from reason alone and the knowledge derived from revelation, and between articles of faith and merely theological conclusions. For instance, more than one interpretation can be given to the assertions that the direct creation of the soul by God is a "Catholic doctrine" (63); that the human soul is an "indispensable link" in the chain of beings that constitute the universe (55); that the assignment of a Guardian Angel to "every human being" is "an article of faith" (313). Moreover, in a work which professes to be chiefly "intellectual," one would expect a little more proof, and a better attempt at the solution of current objections which the educated lay mind will undoubtedly

meet with. Finally it is frequently difficult to depart from the "letter" of scholastic doctrine without obscuring its "spirit." Thus, is the mind to be so identified with the spiritual soul that "the senses can never reach the mind"? (16) This is certainly not the meaning of "mind" to-day—The assertion that there is "an action of some kind of the soul on the body, and of the body on the soul" as the "link" between them (93) would fit in better with the Cartesian system than with the Scholastic doctrine—which the author explicitly holds—of the soul as the *forma substantialis*. Such statements as the following: "All those . . . virtues that may be classed under the heading of purity . . . are the doing of our senses," the virtues of "strength and courage are bodily dispositions" (123-4), and in general "virtue is in the senses, it is the highest perfection of the senses" (127) also call for some qualification, especially when sin is said to be "the concern of the soul as such through free will" (132). Does not formal virtue as well as formal sin require free will? And if virtue is in the senses, does it, like they, "never reach the mind"?

These instances of loose and vague expression—even though others might be added—are not given here for the purpose of lessening the esteem which every reader will have for this work, but rather to show how difficult it is to present philosophical and theological doctrines in a popular form. Not only the lay mind, but the theological mind as well, will derive profit from the reading of this work, and it is no small merit to have gathered together so much information on a subject of paramount importance, the human soul.

C. A. DUBRAY.

---

**Catholic Religion, a Statement of Christian Teaching and History;** by Charles A. Martin. St. Louis, B. Herder, 2nd ed., 1913. 12mo., 486 pp. Cloth, 75 cents net.

The reverend author deserves to be congratulated for having given this fine volume on Catholic Religion to the reading public. And the appreciation of the public is already shown by the fact that the book is now in its second edition. It has the merits of a good popular treatise on the true Church of Christ. It is easy to read, for while every page offers food for serious thought

and careful attention, the language is simple and flowing, and the chapters are divided into numerous short sections that lead the reader on by easy stages. The arrangement of matter shows a good sense of order, a thing which is not always found in books of this kind. It is surprising to see the amount of useful religious information that the author has succeeded in comprising in these four hundred and eighty pages. It is one of the best popular treatises that we have on the Catholic religion, and the remarkably low price at which the book sells—there is a paper edition for thirty-five cents—makes it possible to spread this useful work far and wide. It is destined both to edify Catholics and to help on the conversion of enquiring souls. In another edition, a few improvements might be made. The numerous citations made from modern authors should have the exact references to the works from which they are taken. The name of Hervé Faye should not be omitted in the list of illustrious Catholic astronomers on page 147. Albert de Lapparent, mentioned on page 22 as one of the first scientists of France, should by all means be included on page 150 among the great Catholic geologists, being probably the greatest of them all. On page 44, we read: "Strauss had recourse to the desperate expedient of denying the reality of the death on the cross." The author would do well here to put the name of Paulus in place of that of Strauss. On page 363, Rostok should be Rostock.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Faith;** Sermons Preached at a Men's Retreat, by Mgr. de Gibergues, Bishop of Valence, N. Y. Kenedy and Sons, 1914. 12mo., 155 pp. 75 cents net.

**Religious Indifference;** a Lenten Course by Rev. Andrew Hamerle, C. SS. R. New York, J. S. Wagner, 1914. 8vo., 59 pp. 40 cents net.

**La Crèche, La Croix, L'Autel;** Entretiens et Discours, par l'abbé J. Vaudon. Paris, Bloud, 4ème éd., 1914.

Of these three volumes of sermons, the first, by Bishop Gibergues is the one that appeals most to the thoughtful mind. In six carefully prepared instructions, he sets forth the nature

and characteristics of divine faith, shows how it meets the highest needs of the soul, how it ennobles and sweetens life and brings man into happy communion with Christ, the Author of faith. The language is clear and simple, conveyed, as a rule, in short, pointed sentences. A strong apologetic tone runs through the whole series. The book is printed in excellent type. Owing doubtless to a lack of familiarity of the printer and proof-reader with the Latin language, a number of Latin quotations have suffered at their hands, as on pages 4, 39, 101. These can be easily corrected in a new edition.

Under the title, *Religious Indifference*, Father Hamerle publishes a course of six sermons for Lent. Taking Pilate as a type of the indifferent man in matters of religion, he deals with the causes and results of religious indifference, and as the remedy points to the death of Christ on the cross. There is solid instruction in these pages, but it is presented in a very plain garb, without the grace and attractiveness of an eloquent style.

The volume of sermons by the Abbé Vaudon offers far more interesting reading. The discourses, which are on a variety of subjects, are skillfully grouped under the heads, the crib, the cross, and the altar. He writes as a fervid orator, with an easy, flowing, graceful style, and with an orderly treatment that is generally characteristic of the French pulpit speaker. In this respect the average American priest may take a useful lesson from his brethren across the sea.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### Commencement Exercises, 1914

The Commencement Exercises for the year 1913-14 took place Wednesday, June 17th, in MacMahon Hall. His Excellency, Most Reverend John Bonzano, Apostolic Delegate, presided. After the Conferring of Degrees an eloquent and enlightened address on "The Force of Nationality in History," was delivered by Hon. Hannis Taylor, of Washington, D. C.

The following is the list of graduates:

#### *In the School of the Sacred Sciences:—*

For the Degree of Bachelor of Sacred Theology (S. T. B.):

Rev. John Aloysius Connolly, New York City; Rev. Lawrence Jerome Costello, New York City; Rev. Thomas Joseph Davern, Sioux City, Iowa; Rev. James Charles Devers, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. William Walter Finley, St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. James Benedict Hebron, Altoona, Pa.; Rev. Andrew Aloysius Martin, Springfield, Mass.; Rev. Patrick Joseph Temple, New York City.

Students in Affiliated Seminaries:

Rev. Frederick Michael Gassensmith, C. S. C., Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Patrick Joseph Haggerty, C. S. C., Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Peter Edward Hebert, C. S. C., Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Michael Ambrose Mathis, C. S. C., Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. James Joseph O'Brien, C. S. C., Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Denis Aloysius O'Shea, C. S. C., Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Francis Thomas Burns, The St. Paul Seminary; Rev. Norbert Caspar Hoff, The St. Paul Seminary; Rev. Joseph Leo O'Neill, The St. Paul Seminary; Rev. Jacob Anthony Thiel, The St. Paul Seminary.

For the Degree of Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S. T. L.):

Rev. Matthew Freeman Clarke, Providence, R. I.; Dissertation: "The Influence of the Church on the Amelioration of Slavery in the Later Roman Empire."

Rev. John Xavier Murphy, Providence, R. I.; Dissertation:

"The Pedagogical Methods of the University of Paris in the Middle Ages."

Rev. Theodore Christian Petersen, C.S.P., Paulist Congregation; Dissertation: "A Critical Study of Psalm 109 (110)."

Rev. William Schmitt, Cincinnati, Ohio; Dissertation: "The Concept of Natural Man."

*In the School of Law:—*

For the degree of Bachelor of Law (LL. B.):

John Dunn Brennan, Jr., Pleasant Mount, Pa.; John Joseph Burke, East Hartford, Conn.; Vernon Aloysius Coco, Marksville, La.; John Anthony Colmey, Canandaigua, N. Y.; Maurice Vincent Cummings, Olyphant, Pa.; Charles Lacey McClaskey, Bloomfield, Ky.; Dennis Michael McDonough, Dover, N. H.; Thomas Grover O'Neill, Washington, D. C.; Martin Joseph Parker, Waterbury, Conn.; James Milton Schaller, Newark, Ohio.

*In the School of Philosophy:—*

For the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy (Ph. B.):

Samuel Michael Shay, Merchantville, N. J.

For the degree of Bachelor of Arts (A. B.):

Henry Queen Brooks, Brookland, D. C.; John Adams Hell-dorfer, Baltimore, Md.; Richard Michael Kyle, Fish House, N. J.; John Herbert Linehan, Glen Falls, N. Y.; William Francis McGrail, Cambridge, Mass.; William Anthony Ward, New York City.

For the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.):

Rev. James Joseph Barry, Wichita, Kansas; Dissertation: "The Function of the State in Charity."

Rev. John Joseph Featherston, Scranton, Pa.; Dissertation: "The Socialist Press."

Rev. William Walter Finley, St. Paul, Minn.; Dissertation: "Instruction in Sex Hygiene in the Public Schools."

Stephen Edward Hurley, Fairmount, N. Dak.; Dissertation: "Is the Constitutional Convention a Menace to the American State?"

Rev. Thomas Louis Kelley, Lincoln, Neb.; Dissertation: "A Study of Materialism."

Brother Philip, Ammendale, Md.; Dissertation: "Motives in Education."

Joseph Schneider, Brookland, D. C.; Dissertation: "Naturalization in the United States."

*In the School of Letters:—*

For the degree of Bachelor of Arts (A. B.):

Leo Henry Bartemeier, Muscatine, Iowa; William Cornelius Cronin, Boston, Mass.; Joseph Frederick Gunster, Scranton, Pa.; Edward Peter Kern, Chicago, Ill.; Patrick Francis Kirby, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Daniel William Murphy, Amesbury, Mass.

For the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.):

Leo Behrendt, Washington, D. C.; Rev. George Raphael Carpentier, O. P., College Imm. Conception; Rev. Lawrence Jerome Costello, New York City; Francis James Fleming, Scranton, Pa.; Charles Philip Foley, Springfield, Mass.; Rev. David Ramos, O. F. M., College of the Holy Land.

*In the School of Sciences:—*

For the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.):

Aloysius John McGrail, Cambridge, Mass.

For the degree of Bachelor of Science in Architecture (B. S. in Arch.):

Everett Stanton Beall, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Charles Jabel Robinson, Washington, D. C.

For the degree of Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering (B. S. in C. E.):

August Joseph Bohn, Washington, D. C.; Thesis: "Design for Grade Crossing Elimination at Bennings, D. C."

John Alexander Currin, Baltimore, Md.; Thesis: "Design of Sewage Disposal Plant for Rockville, Md."

Harold Augustus Swift, Scranton, Pa.; Thesis: "Design of Sewer System for Rockville, Md."

Henry John Waldeck, Warren, Ohio; Thesis: "Design of Three Hinged Arch Roof for Drill Shed."



\*John Thomas Welsh, Philadelphia, Pa.; Thesis: "Design of a Highway Bridge."

For the degree of Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (B. S. in E. E.):

Frank Xavier Burda, San Antonio, Texas; Thesis: "The Nature, Determination, and Occurrence of Iron Loss."

Thomas Ryder Lannon, Jacksonville, Florida; Thesis: "Engineering Preliminaries for an Electric Railway between Brookland, D. C. and Takoma Park, Md."

Alberto Ludovic Maillard, Trinidad, B. W. I.; Thesis: "A Discussion of a Method of Distribution of Electrical Power over the Campus of the Catholic University of America."

Ernest Augustus Valade, Randolph Center, Vt.; Thesis: "Engineering Preliminaries for an Electric Railway between Brookland, D. C. and Takoma Park, Md."

For Certificate of Proficiency in Architecture:

\*William Wirt Turner, Barboursville, W. Va.

*In the Catholic Sisters College—*

For the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (A. B.):

Of the Sisters of St. Benedict:—Sister Joseph, Guthrie, Oklahoma.

Of the Sisters of Charity:—Sister Mary Clementine, Greensburg, Pa.; Sister Mary Gervase, Halifax, N. S.; Sister Mary Rosaria, Halifax, N. S.

Of the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary:—Sister Mary Lamberta, Dubuque, Iowa.

Of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word:—Sister Mary Amabilis, San Antonio, Texas.

Of the Sisters of Divine Providence:—Sister Mary Andrea, Newport, Ky.; Sister Mary Aquin, Newport, Ky.; Sister Ida Catharine, Newport, Ky.

Of the Sisters of St. Dominic:—Sister Mary Alma, Newburgh, N. Y.

Of the Sisters of St. Francis:—Sister Marie Antoinette Stella,

\* Conferred February 10, 1914.

Niagara, N. Y.; Sister Constantia, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sister De Pazzi, Buffalo, N. Y.

Of the Gray Nuns of the Cross:—Sister Mary Imelda, Buffalo, N. Y.

Of the Sisters of the Holy Humility of Mary:—Sister Mary Bernardine, Lowellville, Ohio.

Of the Sisters of St. Joseph: Sister Mary Leonilla, St. Louis, Mo.; Sister Rose of Lima, Troy, N. Y.

Of the Sisters of St. Mary:—Sister Aloysia, Lockport, N. Y.; Sister Mary Catharine, Lockport, N. Y.; Sister Mary Louise, Lockport, N. Y.

Of the Sisters of Mercy:—Sister Mary Bernardine, Cincinnati, Ohio; Sister Mary Catharine, Hartford, Conn.; Sister Mary Pierre, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Sister Mary Regina, Cincinnati, Ohio; Sister Mary Rose, Chicago, Ill.; Sister Mary Rosina, Hartford, Conn.

Of the Sisters Servants of the Holy Ghost:—Sister Dominica, Techny, Ill.

Of the Sisters Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary:—Sister Maria Alma, West Chester, Pa.; Sister Maria Concepta, West Chester, Pa.

Of the Ursuline Nuns:—Sister Mary Bernard, Cincinnati, Ohio; Sister Hildegard, Rome, Italy; Sister Mary Magdalen, Cleveland, Ohio.

For the Degree of Master of Arts (M. A.):

Of the Sisters of St. Benedict:—Sister Mary Paul, Duluth, Minn.; Dissertation: "Dreizehnlinden als epische Dichtung."

Of the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary:—Sister Mary Basiline, Dubuque, Iowa; Dissertation: "Educational Value of the Aesthetic among the Egyptians." Sister Mary Crescentia, Dubuque, Iowa; Dissertation: "The Philosophy of the Beautiful and Educational Ideals." Sister Mary Regina, Dubuque, Iowa; Dissertation: "The Psychological Principle of Preparation Anticipated in the Teachings of Christ and His Church."

Of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word:—Sister Mary Kevin, San Antonio, Texas; Dissertation: "Erasmus and Vives on the Education of Women."

Of the Sisters of Divine Providence:—Sister Callista, San Antonio, Texas; Dissertation: "Personality as a Factor in Edu-

cation." Sister Immaculata, San Antonio, Texas; Dissertation: "The Attitude of the Athenian Philosophers toward Democracy." Sister Mary Pia, San Antonio, Texas; Dissertation: "The Educational Aspect of the Principle of Pleasure in Early Christian Education." Sister Mary of Providence, San Antonio, Texas; Dissertation: "Origin and History of the English Sonnet."

Of the Gray Nuns of the Cross:—Sister Vincent de Paul, Buffalo, N. Y.; Dissertation: "St. Augustine's Theory of History."

Of the Sisters of St. Joseph:—Sister Mary Louise, Concordia, Kansas; Dissertation: "Growth and Development."

Of the Sisters of Mercy:—Sister Mary de la Salle, Manchester, N. H.; Dissertation: "The Expression of Thought Relationships by Position." Sister Mary Eulalia, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Dissertation: "The Philosophical Culture of the XIII Century."

Of the Sisters of Providence:—Sister Agnes Clare, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "The Place of the Excursion in Wordsworth's Development as a Poet." Sister St. Aloyse, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "The Principle of Authority in the Educational System of St. John Baptist de la Salle." Sister Francis Helen, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "Historical Bases of the Main Educational Principles of Fenelon's Essay *The Education of Girls*." Sister Mary Genevieve, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "Positive Versus Negative Method in School Discipline." Sister Ignatia, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "A Revision of Primary Methods." Sister Mary, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "The History of Repetition as an Educational Factor in Imparting Abstract Knowledge." Sister Mary Ignatia, St. Mary of the Woods, Ind.; Dissertation: "The Cultural Value of Religion in the Development of the Child."

Of the Sister Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary:—Sister Mary Leo, Scranton, Pa.; Dissertation: "The Relation of Principle to Method in Education." Miss Mary Agnes Cannon, Buffalo, N. Y.; Dissertation: "The Education of Women in the Italian Renaissance."

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.):

Of the Sisters of St. Benedict: Sister Mary Katharine, Duluth, Minn.; Dissertation: "Some Motives in Pagan Education Compared with the Christian Ideal."

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Honor Conferred on Right Reverend Rector.** As the *Bulletin* goes to press news has been received that the Holy Father has conferred a signal honor on the University by elevating Mgr. Shahan to the episcopate. The *Bulletin*, which is Bishop Shahan's foundation, and which owes so much to him, joins with the Faculties and students of the University in congratulating him on this well-deserved sign of approval on the part of the highest authority in the Church.

**Right Reverend Bishop Hayes.** At the same time the Holy Father gave another occasion for rejoicing among the alumni of the University by elevating to the episcopal rank a distinguished and well beloved alumnus of this institution in the person of Mgr. Hayes, of New York.

**The New Chemical Laboratory Building.** Work has been begun on the new chemistry building, which is to be erected on the line of Gibbons Hall and the Graduate Building, between the Mission House and University Station. It is expected that a portion of the building will be ready for occupancy October 1.

**Reverend Father Joseph Kelly,** of the diocese of Alton, a former student of the University, has been honored by receiving the degree of Director of Gregorian Chant from the "Scuola superiore di musica sacra," the Pontifical School of Music. He has also been made a Fellow of the Royal College of Organists in London.



# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*October, 1914.*

*No. 7.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 8.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XX.*

*October, 1914.*

---

*No. 7.*

## PIUS THE TENTH.

---

In the tenth Pius the Catholic University of America lost a true friend. Shortly after he ascended the Chair of Peter the University found itself in grave material straits, and the outlook for its growth and welfare was dark enough. His confidence in the Board of Trustees, his admiration for Cardinal Gibbons, and his paternal encouragement of the administration, were decisive elements in the new and vigorous life that soon asserted itself, and almost immediately consoled and comforted him in no small degree. Whenever it was the good fortune of the Rector to present him a report of the conditions of the University he never failed to exhibit a lively interest in all details, and a profound pleasure at all indications of progress. At an audience in the summer of 1913, after reviewing the work accomplished to date and the prospects of the future he exclaimed: "This great work will surely succeed, for the finger of God is in it." He frequently sought information concerning the progress of the University, and more than once sent his blessing to the professors and students. It is to him that we owe the Annual Collection which has been so helpful a factor in the development of the University, and enables it to rise to such a high level of academic efficiency. To him also we owe the renewal of that source of strength and growth in a beautiful Pontifical Letter, whose warmth and sympathy are not yet forgotten by our clergy and our people. Several ecclesiastical graduates of the University were raised by him to the episcopal dignity, also both the present Rector and his predecessor. He



was pleased to approve all the large Catholic works in which the University had and retains a prominent part, the Catholic Educational Association, the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, the Summer School for our Teaching Sisters and the Catholic Sisters' College. With paternal interest he followed the development of all these good works, and more than once renewed his blessing on all engaged in them. To the present Rector he expressed his profound contentment that the University had suffered no taint of modernistic teaching, and rejoiced that the young institution, so dear to him, had escaped the virus of heresy that threatened the deepest bases of Catholic faith.

Paternal in manner and speech, in temper and action, Pius the Tenth seemed to all who approached him the embodiment of pastoral zeal and charity. The restoration and elevation of the pure Christian spirit and aims, as exemplified in the gospel and the daily life of Holy Church, were his ideals, and it is all too fresh and vivid in our minds how successfully he labored to realize it, by his own saintly and exemplary life, a model of Christian poverty, and by the far-reaching and epochal measures that he took to secure the purest Christian ideals in life, thought, and works. Within a decade he rounded out a plan of the highest pastoral activities, and in all simplicity and frankness executed great reforms and changes which had long stood waiting on a pontiff in whom courage, faith, and insight should be happily combined.

One of the last acts of Pius the Tenth was his beautiful Apostolic Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, in which he encouraged the Catholic women of the United States to complete the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception which they had so zealously and generously begun, and towards which he gave a donation of four hundred dollars as an evidence of his faith in the necessity and timeliness of this great and holy work.

Within the vast periphery of Catholic life are so many and so varied interests, situations, problems, that it is impossible to deal with all at once and with equal thoroughness and success. Hence each pontificate easily takes on its own distinctive character, according as the attention and strength of the supreme

ruler, and his advisers are drawn now to one now to another quarter of the interminable conflict that goes on without ceasing between religion and the world, between secularism and the Kingdom of God, as the latter recruits itself here below for its perfect realization beyond the grave.

The reign of Benedict the Fifteenth will, therefore, differ probably in several respects from that of his great predecessor. The very progress of life, the rapid changes of the civil and social order, the catastrophes of politics, the resurrection of buried issues, the changing angles of human vision, condition and impose what is called the policy of the Holy See, i. e. the résumé of its principles and means of action, the general drift and tendency of its measures and its energies. The new Pontiff emerges on a scene of blood and carnage unparalleled in all history, the final stages of which it is given to no man to forecast. Our most earnest sympathy goes out to the new Successor of Peter as he takes up the most venerable office known to man. What are the problems and difficulties before him? What shall the map of Europe look like when he is gathered to his predecessors? What shall then be the condition of Catholicism now united and harmonious? What shall be the fortune of the Holy See amid the rising confusion and widening conflict? All mysteries which time alone can reveal, but on whose solution the happiness of the modern world very largely hinges. Large and important Catholic interests are at stake in this stupendous war. Their preservation will demand courage, prudence and skill, diplomatic qualities of the first order. The personal qualities and the training of the new Pontiff, as well as his successful administration of the great historic see of Bologna, justify the conviction that he will care for the external situation of the Church with no less zeal and no less success than did Pius the Tenth for the inner life and growth of the Catholic flock. Yet our confidence in the Successor of Peter is not a merely human trust; it reposes on the conviction of divine promises, of the protecting arm of the Most High, whose love for mankind is symbolized and centered in the Vicar of Christ. Countless times, in all stages of political development from barbarism to

Napoleon, the Holy See has emerged entire and vigorous from conditions that threatened or proclaimed its ruin. In it are incarnate the Gospel, the Church, the light of reason, the dignity of mankind, the gains of civilization. Its weakness or decay presage an intolerable despotism, ever novel in form, but ever self-identical, while its progress and influence herald a widening radiance of life, an elevation of human purpose, character and achievements. Today more than ever the see of Peter is an object of profound concern to the vast army of Catholics the world over, since today more than ever are at stake all the progress and good order of religion, all our Christian tranquillity and security of mind and heart, all our hopes of unifying the religious divisions of the past and of re-creating that one fold under one Shepherd which must remain forever, even if forever incomplete, the ideal of all true followers of Jesus Christ. Today the hope burns bright in every Catholic heart that to Benedict the Fifteenth may fall the glorious role of presiding over the counsels that shall bring out of these ineffable horrors a lasting peace, a new and enduring confession of human brotherhood, a newly illumined sense of the unity and true end of mankind, an eternal oblivion of the bad principles, spirit and deeds which for two or three centuries a false philosophy of life, the world and man has begotten over the greater part of Europe, and whose results are daily chronicling themselves in the downfall of the civilized order and the return to a heartless selfishness, the law of the sword and the rule of the mighty.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

## VLADIMIR SOLOVEV AND HIS THEORIES ON THE RELIGIOUS DISSENSION BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

---

During the first year of the twentieth century, Russia lost, as the Russian writers express themselves, the most sincere, idealistic, religious and sentimental of her children,—Vladimir Solovev, the famous thinker, the philosopher of broad and original views, the theologian who fixed his eyes on the impenetrable mysteries of God's life, and devoted the best of his activity, the noblest energies of his generous spirit and of his genius to pacify dissident Christianity, died worn out by work, and perhaps also by the austere asceticism of his life, and dying exclaimed: "Oh, it is really hard to foster God's cause on earth!" . . . But his death ended all the polemics which had been provoked by his writings and gathered about his tomb the most renowned representatives of Russian intelligence. His name, which during his life had been a "*signum cui contradicetur*" was now haloed with glory. Friends and foes vied with one another in extolling his marvelous intelligence, which was accustomed to rise to the highest regions of metaphysics, his character full of nobility and generous ideals, his life wholly and gladly spent in the search of truth, his frankness in unveiling the religious and political evils of Russia (there-with suggesting the proper remedies), and his virtuous examples left to posterity.

The name of Solovev deserves a place of honour in the history of Catholic Theology. The latest and beautiful work of Fr. D'Herbigny, S. J.,<sup>1</sup> has aroused much controversy in regard to Solovev's conversion to Catholicism. The fact of his conversion has been eagerly denied by the Russian writers,<sup>2</sup> and, truly, no documents, except a verbal testimony of doubtful

<sup>1</sup> *Un Newman russe: Vladimir Solovev*, Paris, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Radlov, *Vladimir Solovev, His Life and Doctrine* (Russian), Moskow, 1913.

value, have come to attest the formal adhesion of Solovev to the Catholic Church. In our opinion, Solovev did not abjure outwardly the Orthodox faith, for in such event he would have gained the glory of a visible member of the Roman Church; but inwardly, in the intimate belief of his soul, he had been a professed Roman Catholic, and very few Catholic Apologists of the Papacy have been able to show, with such vigor of logic and science of the Fathers, the necessity of the Primacy and Infallibility, bestowed by the Lord on Peter and his successors. But Solovev did not formally abjure the Orthodox faith, because he was fully convinced that the revolt of the Greek Episcopate, which was headed by Mark of Ephesus, and the subsequent defection of the Russian Hierarchy, had not annulled the decree of union, issued by the Council of Florence. The schism exists as a fact, but not juridically. The bulk of orthodox Christians, who are unaware of the disputes which take place among the theologians, and of the rebellion of their Hierarchy to the Supreme Authority of the Supreme Pastors, continue to partake of the Sacraments of the Church, to practise Christian virtues, to purify themselves in sorrow and in tears, to seek the perfect union with Christ. They are Eastern Catholic Christians, not at all different from the Western Catholic Christians. The union of the Church, the reconciliation of the East with the West, accomplished in the Council of Florence, has not been abrogated in the Eastern Church by any Ecumenic Council; and therefore the Florentine decree of union stands in full strength, because only an Ecumenic Council could repeal the decisions of another Ecumenic Council. Hence, the certainty that he really belonged to the Catholic Church might have prompted Solovev not to utter any formal abjuration, which in his opinion, if he did, might have rendered sterile his apostolate of union in his country.

Whatever proof there may be for or against his conversion to the Catholic Church, there is the undeniable fact, that he must be reckoned among the most eloquent and strenuous apologists of Catholicism in Russia. In one of our works we have put in full light the services rendered by Solovev to Catholic

Theology, and to the cause of union between the Churches.<sup>3</sup> His works on the *Ecclesiastical Power in Russia*,<sup>4</sup> on the *Great Dissension and the Christian Policy*,<sup>5</sup> on the *History and Future of the Theocracy*,<sup>6</sup> and above all his masterpiece, *Russia and the Universal Church*,<sup>7</sup> written in French, fully confirm my assertions. Solovev had over all Western Catholic polemist the great advantage of a thorough knowledge of the Russian soul and Orthodox Theology; therefore it was easy for him to detect the weak sides of his adversaries, to meet them on the same ground, and to show that a principle of dissolution lurks within the heart of Orthodoxy, which gradually impairs the idea of Church unity. His works therefore should be perused by all, who long for the return of the happy ages when the East and the West, bound together by love and by the profession of the same faith, worked in unison for the extension of Christ's kingdom on earth, and for the destruction of the hydra of heresy.

\* \* \*

In a letter to Mgr. Strossmayer, the great Slavonian Bishop, whom Catholic Croatia venerates as a hero and a national benefactor, Solovev evinced the necessity of ending the Eastern schism. "From the unity of the Churches depends the fate of Russia, of Slavism, and of mankind. . . We orthodox Russians, and the entire East with us, are doomed to inactivity until this crime of secession of the Churches will be cancelled, until we yield what belongs to the Supreme Church Authority. Russia and Slavism form in the Christian world the house of David, and He who restores in the world the glory of David's kingdom, received baptism at the hands of John, supreme representative of the Priesthood."<sup>8</sup>

According to Solovev, the dissension between the East and the West was to end for religious and political reasons. He was convinced that Providence had intrusted to Russia a super-

<sup>3</sup> *Theologia dogmatica orthodoxa*, T. I, Florence, 1911, pp. 801-805.

<sup>4</sup> Solovev, *Botchineniia* (Works) T. III, pag. 206-220.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, T. IV, pp. 1-105.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, T. IV, pp. 214-588.

<sup>7</sup> *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle*, Paris, 1889-1906.

<sup>8</sup> Radlov, *Letters of Vladimir Solovev*, T. I, Petersburg, 1908, p. 180.

natural and religious mission. Russia, according to the great writer, is not guilty before God of the heinous crime of schism, which wrested the Eastern peoples from the wholesome influence of Western civilization. Yet Russia, as the religious and political heiress of Byzantium, is destined by God to see the revival and restoration of the religious sentiment of her people, and to constitute the third Rome. As Puskin sang, the huge Russian river some day will absorb the other Slavonic torrents; that is, Russia some day will be the unifying power of all the Slavs. And when this political union will be accomplished, Russia will endeavor to bring about the religious union, to restore all the violated rights of Jesus Christ, first Priest, in the person of the Roman Pontiff. And then the Slavonic race will triumph in the world as the proclaimer and the restorer of peace between the priesthood and the empire; and perhaps there will arise in Russia a Czar, who may recall for the Roman Church the golden age of Charlemagne.

\* \* \*

According to Solovev, Orthodoxy and Catholicism are two branches of the Universal Church, and the redemption, the salvation of Russia is intimately connected with the problem of restoring union between the Western and Eastern Christianity. These theories were set forth in Solovev's first polemic work, published in 1881, and entitled, *O dukhovnoi vlasti v Rossii* (The power of the Church in Russia). Solovev clearly proved in his work that the Russian people are paralyzed in their religious life, that their moral unity is infringed, that from their midst has vanished the influence of a unique religious principle, the soul, heart and source of their life. Active Christianity, or rather faith in the God of the Christians, is nothing else but faith in love, and it is precisely the negation of love that forms the substratum of social life in Russia. The first task of the Church is the revival of society in the spirit of Christ. The Church must always exert her influence on the social body, imbuing it with her own life; and the organ of this influence is "the power," the "Hierarchy. . . ."

Instead the Russian Hierarchy, for centuries, has been be-

numbed by an obstinate lethargy, has disavowed all reforms that mark progress in social life, and, as though this inertness were not sufficient, the Hierarchy, which ought to be a mystic principle of all religious forces, has been in Russia a cause of ruin, a dissolving power. . . . Instead of displaying energy, of winning laurels with the arms of love, the Russian Episcopate scattered seeds of dissension and discord; it strove to strengthen its authority with violence, and ran the risk of losing it. . . . Instead of effecting in the world the perfect unity (*vseedinstvo*), it originated the "raskol," or the internal schism of the Russian Church. The "raskol," which separates from the Russian Church nearly twenty millions of orthodox, is, according to Solovev, a punishment inflicted by God upon the antichristian methods of government employed by the Russian Church, and, at the same time, the logical result of those principles, which provoked the grievous dissension between the East and the West. The old believers of Moscow are not at all different from the Byzantines, who, for trifling questions, dug an abyss between Greeks and Latins. During the ninth and eleventh centuries, the Byzantine Hierarchy had forgotten that the true God is the God of the living, and sought Him among the dry bones of the dead. The schism originated with ritual and disciplinary questions. In his encyclical letter, Photius upbraided the Latins with the custom of fasting on the Sabbath day, with the celibacy of the clergy, the removal of the beard by the Priests, etc. Michael Cerularius branded the Latins as heretics, because in the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist they used unleavened, instead of leavened bread, and this liturgical custom became the main cause of separation between the Churches. The Byzantine Hierarchy gave universal importance to a particular custom . . . in other words, represented its particular opinion as a universal tradition. In short, this failure to discriminate between the eternal element and the transitory element of the Church, between dogmatic truth and national custom, drove the Byzantine Hierarchy to break the bond of unity in the Christian world. The Byzantine Hierarchy substituted orthodox nationalism for the universality of Christendom; it transformed universal Orthodoxy into Greek-Byzantine Ortho-



doxy, and smoothed the path to the process of internal dissolution, which multiplied the autocephalous or independent national Churches of the East.

Heiress of the religious theories of Byzantine, Russia applied them, with sad results, within her boundaries, mixing together dogmas and liturgical traditions, and, with these traditions, contrived a Russian creed and a national Russian Church. The Russian Hierarchy forgot that in Christ's mystic body there is room for all nationalities, but there is no place for "nationalism." The task of all men is the expansion of God's kingdom on earth, but, in order that this aim may be attained, it is necessary that the most diverse peoples combine their efforts, and that the various human races pledge their special aptitudes and manifold activities in behalf of the Church.

\* \* \*

The aforesaid theories were discussed by Solovev in his work *The Schism (raskol) in the Russian People and Society*. The religious conditions of Russia prompted him to widen the field of his researches, to investigate the causes of the schism, not only in the East but also in the West. During the years 1881-1883 he studied very deeply the history of the Papacy and the history of the Eastern schism and imputed also to the Latin world a share of the responsibility of the schism. In a complete study on Solovev's religious thought Prince Eugene Trubeckoi relates an episode, which, as he avers, induced this great Russian to ponder seriously Catholicism. In 1881 Solovev had a strange dream. He seemed to be rambling about in some narrow streets of Moscow. All at once he saw a coach stopped before a palace . . . and shortly after he saw the door of the palace open and a Catholic prelate in his official robes advancing. . . . Solovev bowed to him, seeking his blessing . . . but the prelate hesitated, doubting that it would be lawful to bless a schismatic. Yet, when Solovev spoke and explained to him his theory of the mystic unity of the universal Church, which had not been infringed by the religious dissension between the East and the West, the Prelate was convinced by the strength of his arguments and blessed him, who had spoken with such enthusi-

asm and persuasion of the unity of the Church. Solovev's dream came true a year later, when the Holy See sent Cardinal Agliardi as Delegate to the Coronation of Czar Alexander III. Solovev saw in him the Catholic Prelate who had blessed him in a dream, the house which he occupied and the narrow streets through which he had to pass in order to find him.<sup>9</sup>

We will not put at issue the truth of this episode. . . . Solovev is venerated as a saint and a prophet by his friends and admirers, and, truly, some of his writings and certain phases of his life reveal something of an extraordinary character. Above all, we recall that in 1900 Solovev described with marvelous exactness the future defeat of the Russian army by the Japanese and the insurrection of the Balkans against Turkey.

Solovev devoted the greater part of his writing, *The Great Dissension and Christian Policy* to the study of the Papacy in its relation with the Eastern schism. "The essence," he writes, "of the conflict between the Eastern and the Western Christianity is based, since its origin even to our times, on the question: Is there in the Church of Christ a practical mission to be fulfilled among men? . . . A mission, the achievement of which requires the union of all the forces of the Christian Church and the arraying of these forces under the leadership of a supreme and central ecclesiastical authority. . . . The Roman Church alone proclaims the absolute need of this supreme authority, of this unitive principle of all Christian strengths; the Roman Church alone proclaims the right of leading such strengths to the actuation of the practical mission; in a word, to the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth. Hence the history of the schism cannot be well understood without a preliminary study of the historical importance of the Papacy. The Roman Church exercises in the world a triple mission: (1) a mission merely ecclesiastical in regard to the particular Churches; (2) a politico-ecclesiastic mission in regard to civil power; (3) an individual mission with regard to souls. In this triple mission the Roman Church requires absolute unity, which

<sup>9</sup> *The Philosophical Conceptions of Vladimir Solovev* (Russian), T. I, Moscow, pp. 448-449.

can be obtained only through a supreme ecclesiastical authority which knows no limits in its sphere of action. It promulgates a complete submission of all particular Churches, of the civil power and of the individual souls to the supreme decisions of Rome, and, therefore, it provoked a triple protest. Against the ecclesiastical absolutism of Rome arose the orthodox East; against its political absolutism arose the European States; against the individual absolutism, which requires a complete submission of the intelligence and of the conscience, arose protestantism and rationalism, which are a derivation from the protestant idea. These three protesting elements are still persisting in their opposition to the Roman Church, and constitute the essence of the great dissension between the East and West, afflicting many Christian nations."

The Roman Church, according to Solovev, is on the straight path because she strives for the rights of a central power. Immoveable on her eternal foundation, the Church is also a historical power, and therefore she must develop in the world. . . . She is by nature belligerent and combatant, and this innate characteristic demands a supreme central authority, a canonical Hierarchy and a strong discipline. Against Komiakov, who laid down as the foundation of the Church the negation of all authority, stands the principle of brotherly love. He declares that the Church is not "authority" but "truth," as well as Christ is not "authority," and God is not "authority." Against the legislator of the "*slavophilism*," Solovev established the necessity of a principle of authority as an exigency of the earthly life of the Church, and of the moral conditions of mankind. Christ enlightens the souls, which under those circumstances have no need of "authority" to rise to the knowledge of Christian truths. . . . But it is an undeniable fact that the great majority of men are unable to arise with their own power to the reach of these truths . . . they need guides and teachers . . . the guides and teachers could not be equal to their mission if, in their midst, there should reign a doctrinal discord, if all did not profess the same creed, if all did not impart to their disciples the same doctrine. . . . Hence the unity of doctrine between teachers and disciples demands, as first condition,

unity of "supreme authority." "Against Christendom," so writes Solovev, "arise many hostile forces, upon which mere truth cannot exert any influence, because these forces ramble in the impure field of human passions and cupidities. . . . In the struggle with these enemies, with these dark powers of the world and of corrupt nature, the Church really emerges as an army set in battle array, and, as such, she needs unity of command, of central power and discipline."

Having stated the necessity of a "central power" in the Church, Solovev holds that said power belongs only to the Church of Rome. "There is no Church," he writes, "except the Roman, that claims any supremacy over Christianity. . . . Then one or the other, either, generally speaking, the Church does not need a central power, a central unity; or this central unity must be found in Rome, because outside of that, no other Episcopal See reveals itself as the central See of the Universal Church."

Solovev, while admitting the historical necessity and existence of this supreme ecclesiastical power, marks also its limits. The central power requires an individual, in whom it may be embodied. We have then, in the Church, a Supreme Pastor, who is not merely a Bishop exercising his authority over other Bishops, but the Supreme Pastor of the Church, who rules over millions of subjects. In other words, his supremacy is not exerted within the sphere of the "*potestas ordinis*," but in that of the "*potestas jurisdictionis*." Considered as a Priest, who confers the Sacraments in virtue of the Episcopal order, he does not differ at all from the other Bishops. Considered as the Supreme Head of the Church, his jurisdiction extends over all the members of the mystic body of the Church. He cannot be the primitive source of dogmatic truth, the proclaimer of new revelations, which are not contained in the deposit of Christian Revelation. In the presence of revealed truth he is not superior to a layman, because he must believe and profess all those truths that the lay people believe and profess as members of the Church. Therefore, the prerogative of this "supreme pontifical authority" consists in the "supreme administrative

direction of the Church," so that it may lead in a better way all social and individual energies to the accomplishment of a divine mission on earth. Solovev holds the opinion that the sublime title of "*Head of the Church*," applied to the Roman Pontiff, is not exact. The "*Head of the Church*" should embrace all the members of the Church, without any distinction of places or times; in other words, it ought to be the immortal and powerful spirit of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, a spirit mystically inherent to his tomb and to the Roman Cathedra, and working through a long series of Popes, who are thus united in the bond of unity and solidarity. One can easily detect in this theory of Solovev the influence of Orthodox Theology, which acknowledges in the Church one "invisible" Head, Jesus Christ, and denies the necessity of a "visible" Head.

Solovev leans toward the belief that the Papacy was not always at the height of its mission. The Byzantinism of the East called forth as a reaction, in the West, a current of ideas, which is commonly known under the name of "*papism*." By this depreciative term Solovev denotes "the tendency of the Popes to establish their authority on the foundation of a formal right, to give it a legal basis, to consolidate it with the help of deceitful politics, and protect it with the the material power." This "*papism*" would convert the sublimity of the pontificate into carnal ambition, and the supreme ecclesiastical dignity would assume the character of an earthy dominion. Solovev did not understand the logical and necessary development of the Papacy, which, through wondrous institutions and a wise organization, bound together all Catholic energies and directed them with perfect strategy against the enemies of the supernatural. That is why in Solovev's writings we find words of reproach against the Roman "*centralization*." . . . "The *papism*," he writes, "destroyed the autonomy of the great particular or Metropolitan Churches. One of its aims was the immediate submission of all the Bishops to the Pope's authority. This had as a result the nationalizing of the Church, whereas the Church should be '*over-national*,' that is, it should form a bond of religious unity between the various nations, without abolishing their ethnic character. No doubt the Roman centralization did not provoke

the schism, but it exasperated and embittered the conflict between the East and West, because the first condition imposed upon the Greeks, who were willing to return to Rome, was the adoption of the Latin Rite.”<sup>10</sup>

In its relations with the civil powers, the “*papism*” imprinted upon the theocracy the character of a violent domination. The principle of true theocracy requires that the supreme authority, in the Christian world should belong to the ecclesiastical, rather than to the civil power; the latter must be subordinate to the former, as the body to the soul. On the contrary, the *papism* laid down the principle, that ecclesiastical authority must rule the world with an earthly power. The efficacy of the ecclesiastical power which subdues the world, is found in its spirituality: but this efficacy vanishes, when the ecclesiastical power meddles with intrigues, diplomacy, and arms. As the other earthly powers, so theocracy, destitute of its spiritual strength, will not be able to resist and conquer its foes, and the Papacy, transformed by the *papism* into a diplomatic theocracy, after having unfolded a glorious resistance to the usurpations committed by the German Emperors, became more remissive towards the French monarchy, until, being exhausted, it plunged into the humiliations of Babylon.<sup>11</sup>

Finally *papism* did not respect the liberty of the human person. The attempts to bring the heretics, by force, back to the Church, altered the ideal of the normal relations existing between God and man. The union between God and man must be free and spontaneous; but by means of racks, pyres, and tortures, the moral act of submission of a human intelligence and will to a universal truth, is lowered to the level of an act of physical weakness. Through violence, the ecclesiastical power deprives the individual of the freedom of choice, and therefore it loses its moral authority. In fact, it was in the name of

<sup>10</sup> About the falsity of this statement, consult the several documents contained in our work: *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa*, T. II, Florence, 1913, pp. 4-13.

<sup>11</sup> For Solovev and for Prince Trubeckoi, the true theocracy was at its height under St. Leo the Great, and St. Gregory VII. Cf. Trubeckoi, “*The Notion of God's Kingdom in the Writings of St. Gregory the Great, and his Contemporaries*,” Kiev, 1897.

this freedom of conscience that the individual arose against the Papacy, and this rebellion of souls brought into existence the fiercest enemy of the Catholic Church: *Protestantism*.

To sum up, the Eastern schism was in part the result of the centralizing tendencies of papism, and made it clear that the unity of the Church cannot be fostered by violence; the rebellion of the civil powers against the Church originated with the attempt of papism to conquer the world by coercion, and practically proves that the Church must not establish her authority by material force; finally Protestantism, which was the consequence of the attacks of *papism* on personal liberty, is an evident proof of the principle, that man cannot be induced, by violence, to save his soul.

However, we must observe, that the criticism of the so-called *papism* does not, according to Solovev, invalidate the truth of the Papacy, but the forces that were mustered against it by the errors of *papism*, did more harm than good. Byzantinism shattered the unity of the Church, without substituting another unitive principle. The Churches remained separated and this separation paralyzes the historical activity of Christendom. We are always in the presence of a dilemma: either the necessary centralization of Rome, or the exclusion of Church-unity. "The denial of a central ecclesiastical power produced a chaos in the social order, and the conflict of classes; the exclusion of Church-unity, a chaos in the doctrinal order, and the disunion of Churches and sects." Christian life will flourish again only when the free energies of mankind, setting aside all disputes, more concerned with their duties and freely and fully conscious of their action, will accept the doctrine, which the *papism* of the middle ages endeavoured to promulgate with violence. Then we shall see the end of the great dissension, and the beginning of a Christian policy.<sup>12</sup>

\* \* \*

We are convinced that our readers will not regard the words of Solovev as an invective against the Papacy. The great

<sup>12</sup> *The Great Conflict and the Christian Policy*, pp. 70-95. Trubeckoi, *op. cit.*, T. I, pp. 448-456.

Russian philosopher distinguishes the divinely instituted Primacy of Peter and his successors, from the human element, which at times, deviates from the right path. In his opinion the Popes are *infallible*, but not *impeccable*. If there are mistakes in the luminous march of the Papacy throughout the centuries, these mistakes must not be attributed to the Papacy, as a Divine institution, but to the human element, which sometimes was inspired by merely human interests, and easily yielded to the spirit of the times. To understand better Solovev's idea, we must not forget that he vindicated the Papacy from the accusations of orthodox writers, who not unfrequently dig up again, in their libels, the excesses of the Inquisition, the worldly ambition of the Popes, the death penalty for heretics. Solovev proved against his adversaries, that even the Russian Church was not exempt from such faults as they attributed to the Church of Rome, and that the fact of these faults does not undermine the foundation of the Papacy. To grant, that in the Church of Rome there have been dissolute superiors, does not imply a negation of the supreme authority divinely instituted to preserve the organic unity of the Church. We deplore that Solovev used the term "papism," but since his adversaries make use of this term merely to indicate the Catholic Church, Solovev deemed it proper to use the same term to indicate only whatever may be found worthy of blame, by orthodox writers, in the history of the Papacy.

\* \* \*

The separation of the Churches is one of the greatest calamities that ever befell mankind; their reunion, therefore is a historical problem of great importance. The end of universal history is the free union of mankind in the Church of Christ. This end cannot be attained, before the barriers of schism are demolished; for that reason the Christian policy must aim at the restoration of Church unity. This unity must be complete and real. Complete, that is, it must include the deposit of doctrine, as well as the administrative organism of the Church; real, that is, consisting not only in a pious wish, or in a mere possibility, but in a fact, to accomplish which we combine all



our efforts. This union must be effected not only in the mystic sphere, but also in the field of human relations.

In the mystic sphere, according to Solovev, the unity of the Churches is not only possible, but essentially and really existing. The Church of Rome and the orthodox Church are united to Christ in virtue of a true Priesthood, of an identical profession of faith, and of the same Sacraments. Christ is the Head of both Churches,—The one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church essentially exists in the East and the West, and will exist forever, notwithstanding their mutual enmity. Many illustrious Russian Prelates admit that the Church of Rome is not destitute of Divine grace; they pray for the union of the Churches and receive Catholics into the orthodox Church, without re-baptizing them. The expression "*union of the Churches*" commonly used in the East and the West, shows clearly that the Roman Church and the orthodox Church still partake of the universal Church. The mystic bond which unites the two Churches is not yet broken. If it were broken all the attempts at union would result either in a superficial reapproach, or in the absorption of one Church by the other.<sup>13</sup> Not only mystically, but also doctrinally, the separation of the Churches is not an accomplished fact. According to Solovev, the Eastern Church never defined, nor proposed as dogmas for the belief of the faithful, doctrines, that conflicted with Catholic truth. The dogmatic definitions of the first seven Ecumenical Councils constitute a sum of immutable truths, constantly and universally maintained in its fulness by the Eastern Church. All teachings not sanctioned by these Councils in orthodox theology must be regarded as particular teaching of private theologians, more or less esteemed, but destitute of authority, which inheres to infallible mastership. Solovev makes a keen distinction between the official orthodox Church and the servile Church of the Theologians. The doctrine of the first is holy, and we find it expressed in solemn and decisive formulas, in

<sup>13</sup> *Letters*, T. I, pp. 182-184. Solovev's doctrine is not new to Catholic theologians of Greek lineage and education, such as Allatius, Papadopolus,—Comnenus, and Arcudius. Cf. *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa*, T. II, pp. 174-175.

the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils; while the doctrine of the theologians not rarely deviates from the right track, and is a factor of bitter controversies. It follows that the opinions of the Eastern theologians, being opposed to Catholic truth, may not be held as binding and infallible dogmas, and as they lack the sanction of an Ecumenical Council, may not be attributed to the Eastern Church, which comprises the whole body of the faithful of the East.

A similar phenomenon often occurs in Catholic Theology. The Thomistic school, for a long while, opposed the sublime truth of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, but it would be impious effrontery to ascribe to the whole Latin Church the denial of that truth. "Our distinction," writes Solovev, "greatly favours the cause of Church union. The dogmas of our Church may be limited to the decisions of Ecumenical Councils, and consequently they are strictly orthodox and Catholic. While on the contrary the anti-catholic doctrines, of the Eastern theologians, are not dogmas of faith, defined by the Church. Hence, we are united to the Catholic Church, in what we hold as essential and immutable truth, while the errors, which separate us from Catholic unity, are private opinions, which do not bear the sanction of the Supreme Authority."

The cause and vitality of the schism cannot even be attributed to the different tendencies of the Eastern and Western spirit. The East is passive in its relations with the Divinity, while the West is active. But these two different tendencies represent only two different manners of conceiving the relations between God and man, and therefore cannot be regarded as the efficient cause of the schism. The tutelage of revealed truth formed the main task of the orthodox East, while the task of the Catholic West was based on the organization of all the energies of the Church under the leadership of a unique and independent Ecclesiastical Authority. These two tasks, instead of excluding, complete one another. Christendom is at the same time contemplative and active. The unilateral development of the East and the West, which, after the schism, pursued different courses, was the main cause of failure in the universal mission of Christendom. The schism then rests on

the administrative disagreement existing between the two Churches. The Roman centralization is one of the most serious obstacles to the union of the Churches."

The Eastern Church, and particularly the Russian, never took part in the Western Patriarchate. The uniform centralizing of power, which has taken place within the boundaries of the Latin Church, may not be attributed to the Russians. The present constitution of the Catholic Church, was determined, to a certain extent, by the calamitous event of the Eastern schism, which for various centuries has confined Catholic activities to the Latin Patriarchate, while the universal Church was to regain in unity what she had lost in extension. But, this unity once restored, the Catholic Church, ever remaining Roman, on account of the centre of unity, would not be entirely and exclusively Latin and Western, as it is now, in her organization and administration, although she tolerates other rites. "*Roman*" is the title of the Church, if we consider her centre, which is immutable and identical, "*Latin*," if we consider only a large section of the universal Church. But, in this case, the part should not absorb the whole. The Church of *Rome*, and not the *Latin Church*, is the "*mater et magistra omnium Ecclesiarum*"; the *Bishop of Rome*, and not the *Patriarch of the West*, is infallible, when he speaks "*ex Cathedra*." We must not forget, that there was a time, when the Bishops of Rome spoke Greek. There are in our midst many orthodox faithful, who would willingly join Rome, but who refuse to be latinized. In order to allay their fears it is necessary to assure them that the Eastern Church, upon returning to the unity of Catholicism and recognizing, in the Chair of Peter, the supreme Authority, bestowed by Christ for the tutelage of unity, will retain not only her rite, but also that autonomy of organization and administration, which was enjoyed by the East, previous to the separation of the Churches.<sup>18</sup>

\* \* \*

Catholicism and Orthodoxy, according to Solovev, would gain immensely by their union. Rome would gain a pious people,

<sup>18</sup> *Letters*, T. I, pp. 188-189.

enthusiastic for religion, a faithful and mighty defender. On the other hand, Russia, to whom God has intrusted the destinies of the East, not only could free herself from the involuntary crime of schism, but would be able to fulfill her noble mission, to assemble about her standards all the Slavs, to foster a new civilization, really Christian, that is, endowed with the characteristics of a unique truth, and a manifold liberty in the supreme principle of charity, which comprises the whole in unity, and distributes to all men the fulness of the supreme good.<sup>14</sup>

Furthermore, this free and spontaneous alliance between the East and the West, of the Roman and Orthodox Churches, on the religious field, would produce the effect of enervating Protestantism. Our free and moral adhesion to the principle of authority, which is the foundation of Catholicism, would divest this principle of its violent, external, and coercive character, which gave origin to Protestantism. When we, Orthodox and Catholics, united together in the mystic body of Christ, will become aware of our unity and will cement it with love, then the protestant principle of liberty will also be practically applied, and will concur to complete the perfection of the Church on this earth, perfection consisting of a free theocracy.<sup>15</sup>

\* \* \*

"*Free theocracy*," behold the expression, which wonderfully abridges the theories of Solovev on the union of the Churches. Perhaps no other theologian has ever dealt with the "*unity of the Church*" so logically and clearly, as Solovev did. The salvation of Christianity, the cessation of intestine struggles among the Christian flock, depends on the recognition by orthodox and protestants of the necessity and real existence of a central power in the Church, and of a Supreme Pastor, infallible judge of all religious controversies. Solovev was an earnest and sincere defender of this essential principle of Catholicism, and his name, therefore, deserves to be reckoned among the names of Catholic apologists.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pag. 189.

<sup>15</sup> *The Great Dissension*, pp. 95-100.

But Solovev was also an ardent patriot, a man who firmly believed a providential mission had been intrusted by God to the Russian people. The influence of this patriotism appears in his manner of conceiving the union of the Churches, in the large autonomy he claims for the East, and in the restoration, advocated by him, of the administrative organization of the universal Church, which was in force previous to the schism of Photius. He conceived the universal church, as Latin Church in the West, subject to the immediate jurisdiction, and the supreme authority of Rome; and as Greek Church in the East, subject to the immediate jurisdiction of the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, and to the supreme direction of Rome. In his judgment, the bond of love, more than juridical submission, should unite the Eastern Churches to the Church of Rome; and in this point his doctrine is a direct consequence of the principles laid down by the Slavophiles, and namely by Khomiakov.

It is not for us to decide whether the plan and the conditions for this union, proposed by Solovev, may be accepted or not. In a matter so important, the last decision belongs to the Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority. However, we are glad to acknowledge that Solovev has cast marvelous light upon the idea of Christian unity, and has suggested the only remedy that may heal the evils of the separate Churches, that is "the avowal of a unitive centre, of a Supreme Pastor." Until the separate Churches will acknowledge the divine institution of this Supreme Head, they will not display exuberance of life, nor fecundity of good works, and the Christian world, afflicted by intestine struggles, will not be able to meet, and overcome so many hostile hordes, which are ready to plunder the kingdom of Christ on earth.

F. A. PALMIERI.

## THE "SON OF MAN," A PROPHECY UNFULFILLED

---

This essay embraces not so much a study as a summary of results. It aims at sketching a framework in which one of the most warmly debated gospel topics may be clearly and consistently understood. It is far from purporting that the last word has been, will or can be said in the near future, on this or any other of the intricately allied problems relating to the kingdom of God.

The mysteriousness enshrouding the discussion is partially due to the intrinsic unintelligibility of revelation, but the more notable fraction is ascribable to the insufficiency of historical data furnished by the Evangelists.

It pertains to theology to embroider its gorgeous fabric with the silken threads skeined for it in dogmatic definitions and decisions. It is the Scripturist's task to spin the silk, or to show how it is spun, before it is removed from the cocoon. If there is mystery in dogma, there is competent authority and a living voice to bolster it up. If there are new-born obscurities in Scripture, it is because the voice that spoke or the pen that wrote has transmitted only a part of what might enlighten us, and that part, enacted in a foreign land, among an ancient people, beneath an eastern sky, has sometimes reached us in mirage. An advance is made when the mirage is pierced and the caravan passes on to search out the reality miles beyond. How very little direct knowledge do we possess of the times and immediate environment of Christ! How very little of His life divine! Even the language or the dialect He used has reached us in fragments.

At present we are to treat of the "Son of man" as a "sign"<sup>1</sup> a title,<sup>2</sup> and a prophecy.<sup>3</sup> Are all three designations distinct, or are they but one? The sign is the prophecy; the title, neither; yet it serves to mark the person who is to fulfill both.

<sup>1</sup> Mt. xxiv. 30.

<sup>2</sup> John, i, 51, and *passim* in four gospels.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. vii, 13.

This position is tenable from many points of view, although it is offered only in its relation with biblical parallels and the unfailing words of the Son of Man himself.

Sign, among the Hebrews *אוֹת*, had the specific sense of "pledge." Under this category ranked prophecies and miracles, the pledges of an inalienable providence and the fidelity of God to His promises. The prophecy of Emmanuel's birth was "a sign" from the Lord to Achaz.<sup>4</sup> Jonas, *as he was read of*, was a "sign" to the "wicked and adulterous generation."<sup>5</sup> Similarly, "the *sign* of the Son of man," so peculiarly native in St. Matthew, may be interpreted as synonymous with the *written* prophecy in Daniel, vii, 13 ff. The *appearance* of the sign may be expressed less figuratively as the appearance of its truthfulness in accomplishment. St. Matthew, grammatically analyzed, does not locate the sign itself in the heavens, knowing that it was in a book; but he states on our Lord's authority that the Son of Man, whom "The Book" depicted "coming with the clouds of heaven,"<sup>6</sup> would one day verify the sign in which all believed. The metonymy is between sign and thing signified.

\* \* \*

The *title*, "Son of man," is more involved. Without the article, the Judean Aramaic *Bar-enash* may mean one born of man, one having human nature, or periphrastically, man, without further qualification. The phrase implied the notions of weakness, lowliness, frailty, mortality, and corresponded to the Hebrew *Ben-adam* applied by God to the prophet Ezechiel.<sup>7</sup> *Bar-nasha*, which is acknowledged to be Galilean Aramaic, was presumably the form adopted by our Lord.

The post-apostolic Fathers have frequently insisted upon this signification to emphasize the reality of Christ's human nature. In the primitive Church no additional importance was attached to the title, and the farther we go back, the less we find it in use.<sup>8</sup> Among the Gentiles it might have run the

<sup>4</sup> Ia. vii, 11, 14.

<sup>5</sup> Mt. xii, 39.

<sup>6</sup> Dan. vii, 13.

<sup>7</sup> Ez. ii, 1, 3, 6, etc., *passim*.

<sup>8</sup> *Rev. Bibl.*, 1900, pp. 173-4.

risk of being construed in a sense opposed to the virginal birth, and so, was perhaps intentionally suppressed, just as in the course of centuries, participation of the Holy Eucharist under both kinds was suppressed among the faithful, once there was danger of losing from sight the totality of Christ's presence in each separate species.

But the Jews were not gentiles in anything but their common heritage, faith in Christ, and they viewed the entire deposit of faith from a different angle and under a characteristic phase. For the Hebrew convert, the only radical inner change to be effected in espousing the Christian cause was what may be styled a change of direction. As an Israelite, he was already blessed with faith, faith in Jehovah, faith in the election of his people, faith in the Law and the prophets. He had only to add one more object to his belief, one towards which all others converged, and he would have faith in Christ. The same way in which he had formerly tended towards God, he must now tend towards Christ, and instead of holding that the Messiah *would* come, he must now hold that he *had* come.

Looking backward from the vantage-ground of Christianity he could see the landmarks and milestones along which he had laboriously passed, but never before had he taken the pains to glance either at the sides now facing him or down the long avenue shrinking so rapidly in the distance and broadening into glory at his feet. It was indeed the right way, a chosen way, more sacred than Delphic or Egyptian thoroughfares of treasures or sphinxes, but its mighty charm curled outwards from its end and the retrospect was, as it were, through a microscope reversed. In the past there was much to retain and much that was easily forgotten, but among his memories there lingered enough to certify him that what he possessed had long ago been promised and that the dream of expectation had met with values unsurmised. Present fulfilment was all-absorbent and the future guaranteed.

The gist of these reflections is that if one or other of the prophecies, or their organic unity as a whole, escaped the notice of interested Hebrews, it is not astonishing that among gentile proselytes, whose spiritual instinct was slow in developing,



these same and many other features should go for long years unobserved. The trend of catechetical instruction in Hellenic circles was, as is evidenced in St. Mark's gospel, toward enforcing the claims of Christ less by appealing to prophecy than by producing the testimony of contemporary witnesses and miracles. It was St. Matthew in writing for his own kindred who excelled in the former method.

\* \* \*

The *prophecy* of the Son of man is one that was constantly lurking beyond the Jewish horizon, one that agitated the masses because of their confused and distorted messianic hopes, and one that is perhaps partly accountable for the state of fear and dread which St. Paul was endeavoring to correct at Thessalonica when he wrote: "We beseech you, brethren, . . . that you be not easily moved . . . nor frightened . . . neither by spirit, nor by word . . . as if the day of the Lord were at hand." <sup>9</sup> It runs as follows:

"I beheld, therefore, in the vision of the night, and lo, one like the SON OF MAN came with the clouds of heaven, and he came even to the Ancient of days; and they presented him before him. And he gave him power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve him: his power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away: and his kingdom shall not be destroyed." <sup>10</sup>

The prediction might not have influenced the first Christians in the manner described but for the fact that our Redeemer throughout His public career, had identified Himself with "*the Son of man*,"—always using the article—and no one had grasped the exact import of the title till after the passion, resurrection and ascension. Preliminary to discussing the claim set forth in the title, the prophecy requires slight explanation.

Daniel had previously been shown in his dreams four monstrous beasts that were either slain or dispossessed of their power preparatory to the apparition of the Son of man. Trembling and affrighted he sought an interpretation and was in-

<sup>9</sup> II Thea. ii, 2.

<sup>10</sup> Dan. vii, 13, 14.

structed that the "four great beasts are four kingdoms . . . but the saints of the most high God shall take the kingdom: and they shall possess the kingdom for ever and ever."<sup>11</sup>

The symbolism is highly colored and graphic. The four beasts are four kingdoms; the son of man is the saints! But the saints constitute a kingdom and only as a kingdom are they introduced. In oriental as in western terminology, the king is his kingdom, and vice versa: the two are one. In the imagery of Daniel, because of this usage, the Son of man may seem confused with the saints, but in reality he is their king;<sup>12</sup> and they under his dominion form with him a single moral and social unit.

The accession of the Son of man is as visible as the domination of the beasts, but there is no fixed chronological connexion between them. The beasts enjoy priority of time, not immediate temporal precedence. They are crushed in solemn judgment by the Ancient of days and are afterwards appointed "times of life . . . for a time and a time" all before the unexpected revelation and installation of the Son of man.<sup>13</sup> Here is a manifest period of separation which releases us from the obligation of restricting historical kingdoms to four, or of maintaining that the militant Church must somehow be exclusively the fifth and last.

Daniel nowhere pretends to see all, and the historic kingdoms which he did see ought to be taken as types of the world and the powers of darkness in general rather than a complete and succinct delineation of successive revolutions, empires or dynasties. In any other supposition, the interminable labyrinthine expositions that have been volunteered from every quarter for each separate beast, each row of teeth, each pair of wings, each distinct horn of this marvellous picture seem one and all devoid of practical working value. Daniel's concreteness and particularity of expression point him out as an oriental; his

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* vi, 17, 18.

<sup>12</sup> With the text placed in this, its proper perspective, it is not clear that the Book of Enoch plays, or is needed to play, such an important rôle in individualizing the Son of man, as is sometimes represented.

<sup>13</sup> *Dan.* vii, 12.

imagery is borrowed from Babylonian environment; his religious convictions are on the canvas of Davidic and Isaian predictions; his visions and revelations are from God. His personal contribution to Old Testament prophecy in the present instance consists in having brought out in bolder relief a divine promise that for the time seemed to many of his fellow-exiles in captivity, impossible of fulfillment. The eternal throne of David,<sup>14</sup> the supremacy of his native land and the race elect, had either prematurely ceased or had been so violently interrupted that no human eye could see the outcome. Yet God was directing all, and the prophet's unswerving faith in Him procured illumination and vision of a glorious future conquest in which the "Son of man," the "woman's seed" should crush the serpent's head forever. The new oracle is the direct correlative of the protevangelium. It forecasts the final evolution in the age-long series of providential interventions that began with the Immaculate Conception.

\* \* \*

Attempts to substantiate even the partial fulfillment of this prophecy in the life of Christ are futile. Jesus did not carry out any one of its terms. He did not come in the clouds of heaven. Instead of receiving a kingdom already established, He founded one,<sup>15</sup> and this, while yet in its infancy, He handed over to vice-gerents. He continues to exercise an invisible supremacy, but the Son of man in Daniel was as visible as the animals he crushed. Moreover, at no period of history could it be truthfully said that "*all* peoples, tribes and tongues" were visibly serving Him.

If there had been any obvious intent on our Lord's part to correspond during His earthly life or in militant Christendom with the requisitions of Daniel, surely St. Matthew, whose method of apologetics is saturated and dyed in prophecy, could not have overlooked it. Add to this that St. Stephen<sup>16</sup> and St. John the Evangelist,<sup>17</sup> although beholding the Son of man in glory, do nowhere testify that He *had* come "with the clouds."

<sup>14</sup> II Kings, vii, 16.

<sup>15</sup> Apoc. i, 6.

<sup>16</sup> Acts, vii, 55.

<sup>17</sup> Apoc. i, 7.

The latter, on the contrary, announces over sixty years after the ascension, that He is still *going* to come (*ἔρχεται*).

Why then did our Savior from first to last of His public career call Himself "*the Son of man*"? The title occurs thirty-one times in St. Matthew, fourteen times in St. Mark, twenty-five times in St. Luke, twelve times in St. John, and always on *His* lips.<sup>18</sup> From these passages critics deduce that our Lord applied the title to Himself on approximately forty or forty-two recorded occasions. The designation was not used by the disciples until after the ascension because, doubtless, they were, like their contemporaries, extremely tardy in grasping the allusion to Daniel. At first they very likely comprehended through it little more than a vague and humble profession of Christ's love for lowliness and the holy.

In the popular imagination, made fervid by a mass of apocalyptic literature and utterances, the ideas of the Son of Man and His kingdom were most diverse, not to say, material and gross. As a consequence, nobody felt that Jesus was he. It was not uncommon for prophets to assume strange names, perform symbolic actions or do unheard-of "signs," and Bar-nasha passed among the multitudes as "the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee."<sup>19</sup> His reputed origin was supposed to stand against His messianic character.<sup>20</sup>

\* \* \*

The disciples were the first to receive any intimation that the Master's favorite title, Bar-nasha, had to do with the Danielic Bar-enash. As far as historic evidence is available, there was perhaps nothing in the life of Christ that would have led an impartial observer to identify Him with *the Son of Man* aside from His own word. So true is this that when Jesus began latterly to inculcate belief in the obscure prerogative as belonging to himself, the masses reasoned against Him: "We have heard out of the Law that the Christ (Messias) abideth forever; and how sayest thou: 'The *Son of man* must be lifted up, (*i. e.*, crucified)' Who is this Son of man?"<sup>21</sup> Certainly, not the one with whom Daniel has familiarized us!

<sup>18</sup> Cfr. Lesêtre in Vig., D. B., s. v. Fils de l'homme.

<sup>19</sup> Mt. xxi, 11.

<sup>20</sup> John, vii, 41.

<sup>21</sup> John, xii, 34.

This reply leaves no doubt as to a persuasion regarding the messianic character of Daniel's Son of man, and from this state of mind it follows that, had Jesus at any time openly maintained His Messiahship, He would simultaneously have imposed belief in His *character* of "Son of man," but He refrained. As late as the third year of the public ministry, when the disciples with Peter as spokesman confessed the Messiahship,<sup>22</sup> they were first of all commended, then rigorously hushed. Commended: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Hushed: for "He commanded His disciples that they should tell no one that He was Jesus, *the Christ*. . . ." <sup>23</sup>

\* \* \*

The motive of this mysterious secrecy grows palpable in the history of the passion. In illegal convocation, held at a forbidden hour, for an unjust cause, the high-priest Caiphas who, as judge, was not entitled to accuse, adjured the divine prisoner "by the living God" to tell if He were Christ, the Son of God. Son of God, Son of David, Son of Man, Messias (or Christ),—all were intercommunicable titles, so that Jesus was not held to be evasive when He answered: "Thou hast said it. Nevertheless, I say to you, *hereafter* you *shall see* the *Son of Man* sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven." <sup>24</sup>

Three days previously, Christ had privately uttered the same prediction to His disciples.<sup>25</sup> He had been listened to with silence and submission. But now these have fled; one of them is denying Him; and the high-priest, rending his garments, exclaims: "He hath blasphemed, what further need have we of witnesses?"

Caiphas gloated on his success. He had taken the initiative in proclaiming the expediency of sacrificing one man for the nation,<sup>26</sup> and when every ruse had failed to ensnare Christ in

<sup>22</sup> Mt. xvi, 14-16; Mk. viii, 27-29; Lk. ix, 18-20.

<sup>23</sup> Mt. xvi, 20; Mk. viii, 30; Lk. ix, 21.

<sup>24</sup> Mt. xxvi, 64; Mk. xiv, 62.

<sup>25</sup> Mt. xxiv, 30; Mk. xiii, 26; Lk. xxi, 27.

<sup>26</sup> John, xviii, 14.

speech, he resolved to play alone the fatal part in the unjust aggression. He had shared in the strong suspicion agitating the masses when they demanded: "Who is this Son of Man?" Yet, unlike the populace, he had determined in advance that any claim laid to the title *under its Danielic aspect* by "the Prophet" now before him, would be an outrage. He dared not make the charge so long as Jesus refused to commit Himself; but on perceiving the silence broken, he cried out to the witnesses: "Behold, now you have heard the blasphemy. What think you? They answering said: He is guilty of death."<sup>27</sup>

This most solemn deposition of our Savior, elicited in such perilous circumstances has as strong a claim to be construed in its most obvious sense as the Eucharistic discourse at Capharnaum. It is a frank avowal on the part of Christ that, while He is the Son of Man, He has *not yet* fulfilled the oracle of Daniel. It is He who *will* come on the clouds, not who *has* come. Why then should so much energy be expended in crowding four symbolic kingdoms,—just four and no more,—into the period between Daniel and the birth of Christ, in order to make room for an immediate fifth, the complete consolidation of which Christ himself postpones to the end of the world?

Daniel presupposes the kingdom in existence before the day of triumph, but he is impenetrably silent about its founder or foundation. This is the circumstance that enabled our Lord, without coming into direct collision with the people or the authorities, to identify Himself as Bar-nasha even while establishing the kingdom. The kingdom is the Church. It was founded as "the kingdom of heaven,"<sup>28</sup> "the kingdom of God";<sup>29</sup> whose members are called "to be saints";<sup>30</sup> whose founder and finisher are one.<sup>31</sup> The organization of this everlasting world-power was Christ's life-work, and is the central, necessary, unifying idea of all we know about Him. Its growth, progress and development He forestalled, but only as distant

<sup>27</sup> Mt. xxvi, 65-66; Mk. xiv, 63-64.

<sup>28</sup> Rom. viii, 28.

<sup>29</sup> Mt. iii, 2; v, 3, etc.

<sup>30</sup> Apoc. i, 6-8.

<sup>31</sup> Mk. i, 15, etc.

harbingers of a sublime destiny. The "saints" in Daniel are "the elect" in the gospel, and all these must be gathered into the kingdom *before* "the sign of the Son of Man" will appear.

Meanwhile, St. John, who seems to have understood in this light "the times of life" allotted by Daniel to the wicked "for a time and a time," interposes turmoil, and travail, and persecution, and affliction, woes without stint or number, leaving to the end of them all the triumphant voice that issues forth from the throne: "Behold, I make all things new."<sup>32</sup>

It is in the "regeneration" of heaven and earth that Barnasha will come again, surrounded by the disciples on their twelve thrones.<sup>33</sup> Just why the key to the situation and to the promises, was so effectually withheld from publicity until the last days of the Redeemer's mortal career, was owing to His intimate knowledge of the hearts and passions of His adversaries. The event showed conclusively that any premature announcement would have precipitated the final crisis and, humanly speaking, would have cut short the "Father's business" which He had come on earth to do.

THOMAS A K. REILLY, O. P.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION COLLEGE,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

<sup>32</sup> Apoc. xxi, 5.

<sup>33</sup> Mt. xix, 28

## "ETHNA CARBERY": A WOMAN WHO LOVED IRELAND.

---

Of all those who have come to Erin and been won to her—and their name is legion—few have been more deserving of mention than she who wrote under the *nom de plume* of Ethna Carbery. Few have proven themselves more loving, more loyal, or more optimistic. Her heart she devoted to the cause of Ireland and her spirit was ever courageous and ever hopeful. She served that cause with her pen. She was instrumental in keeping many a soul keen to the charms of the old ways, whether amid the strife and troubles in foreign lands or amid the seemingly endless and purposeless struggle on bare hills; and she awakened in many an alien heart a feeling for the lure of the green sod.

There have been many, in times past, who have come from afar and been won to an idea or an ideal. There have been many who have bent mind and heart and pledged their hands to work toward what they deemed a great and worthy purpose. To forget one's own petty and inconsequential, selfish desires, to be willing and ready—nay, eager—to make definite sacrifice for a belief, perhaps even to make that sacrifice—this as actually wonderful to think upon and to realize as true. And so, it is interesting to read, in the case of Ethna Carbery, her own statement in a poem entitled *The Reason Why*:

Because you brought the hills to me—  
The dear hills I had never seen,  
All sweet with heather down the braes,  
And golden gorse between—

Where sings the blackbird in the dawn,  
And where the blue lake-water stirs,  
And where the slender wind-blown sedge  
Shakes all its silver spurs.

Because you loved the country ways,  
Whereon your happy feet were set.  
Nor was the calmness of your days  
Stirred by one vexed regret.



But in your ever kindly word  
I heard my unknown kinfolk call  
My roving heart to find its rest  
Afair in Donegal.

She journeyed to Ireland, married a true Irishman, and at once became one of the people. When the liking for the land grew upon her she felt that she must be of it—it was a call that none could resist. The call of the blood in her veins—the call from half-forgotten Irish ancestors—was too strong to deny. Her heart knew it had found its home, her mind saw before it a work to do. She remained, to live with the quiet Irish folk, for there she knew contentment, and she joined herself to the roll of Ireland's adherents. What more natural than that she should mate herself with one who had lived the life and was saturated with the spirit of the land; who, like herself, loved the charm of the present and looked to more glorious days to come. She was but coming into her own.

Suppose, my reader, an orchestra were to play a piece of music—a piece of music in which three separate and distinct themes appear, give place, and re-appear in turn, and ever again fuse to give a mingled strain. Such would be the type of the writing of Ethna Carbery and the three moods which, successively and in conjunction, rule her hand upon the lyre, are moods of her own love for the things of nature, the true Irish patriotism, and the passionate love of man and woman.

The purple moorlands, the blue loch, the call of the cuckoo in the spring, the hills, the sweet bird voices, the quiet green hollows, and the companionship of the Gentle Folk—these conspired to lure her heart to a love for the wind-swept heather and the gray glens of Donegal. The attraction was partially the attraction of nature and partially that of the spiritual heritage of Ireland. The poems entitled *In Tir-na'-nog*, *In Donegal* and *The Heathery Hill* may be taken as illustrative of Ethna Carbery's love of the out-of-doors of Irish hill country. In each of these there is evinced keen appreciation of every smallest detail.

She looked on the dear sights with a loving eye and her affection moved many to a like enthusiasm. In great masters

of literary productions—in the case of Pope, Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats, for instance—there has been evident a certain definite manner of observing or using the details of nature; the interpretation of one of these poets was highly conventionalized, that of another spiritual and moral, that of another beautiful, inspired and figurative, that of another utilitarian, for building gorgeous and varied vegetation into beautiful backgrounds. Each of these four had a distinct way of looking at the life of the world; we can formulate from the works of each a definite theory of nature interpretation; but we can do no such thing in the case of Ethna Carberry. Her view was ever simple and direct—it was born of an appreciation unaccompanied by theory. Thus it is that we can say of her, first and last, that she loved what she saw for its own sake. Beauty in still life called up in her mind no associations; she built no elaborate analogies; she merely spoke of what pleased her in a tone of awed admiration. That is all, yet, is not that enough? Her little sketches of nature are marvelously suggestive. To read is to see and feel.

Ethna Carberry's was a very distinct though a very limited genius. The very simplicity of her vision precludes the possibility of discussion. There are no ideas to discuss, there are no complicated interpretations to analyze, over which to enthuse; or with which to disagree. Thus, we have little to say. We can merely state the chief characteristics of her work and mete out a proper proportion of praise. We would that each reader of this paper would go through the three volumes of her published works<sup>1</sup> and personally come into contact with her mind and spirit.

Ardent Irish nationalists can never forget the past of their country; and this woman was alive to the beauty and splendor of the old times. In prose and song she celebrated the dim and far-off days. The volume called *In the Celtic Past* comprises a number of hero tales, tales of adventure, of love, of legend and myth, tales which reveal the very heart of the ancient race.

<sup>1</sup> *The Passionate Hearts*, *In the Celtic Past*, and *The Four Winds of Birinn*, all issued in America by Funk and Wagnalls, of New York.

Among the poems included in the complete collection in *The Four Winds of Eirinn* we find many that dwell on Irish history and legend. *The Shadow House of Hugh, Niall Glen dubh to Gormlai* (A. D. 913), *The Betrayal of Clannabuidhe* (Belfast Castle, Nov., 1574), *Brian Boy Magee* (A. D. 1641), Hugh O'Neill, Moorlock Mary, Donal McShan of the curses, who took the garrison of Liscallaghan, Oct. 23, 1641, *Rody M'Corley* and innumerable other heroes of Irish history and folk lore are subjects of stirring poems, Niamh, the enchantress with "wind-blown flying hair" of whom Mr. Yeats has found pleasure and profit in writing, forms the theme of a superb piece which for sheer haunting magic and beauty of mood surpasses the work of the leader of the so-called Irish Revival. Ethna Carbery wrote a splendid, inspiring *New Year Song* for 1898—the centennial year of what was probably the most disastrous Irish Rebellion, and she wrote another bravely-optimistic piece called *In Glengormley*, which ends:

Lift your sad eye to the hills, mavourneen  
Where true hearts yearn for the gray to be;  
The gold dawn flushes your grey sky over,  
God's Sun will soon shine on you, Gramachree.

Two patriotic pieces, *Shiela ni Gara* and *Mo Chraoibhin Cno*, ought to be ranked among the best Irish poems ever written. Here we find strong spiritual courage amid material defeat. And what an inspiration! One cannot but be courageous in writing to a people to whom it could be said: "In lands and cattle—all things of a day—you're very poor; but rich beyond a miser's dream in those that last forever. Your coat is old and faded, but clothes a shining soul—is shabbed and poor, but yet the heart it hides could not be purchased with the gold of Spain. Your cabin on the mountain bleak is poor and lowly, wind-swept, but its hearth is warmed by fire from heaven."

The present writer has a little theory, which he has several times stated, that it is not Mr. Yeats and his followers who yearn for, and take pleasure in, a vague and indefinite beauty of the past, but that it is rather a group of young writers of the last decade-and-a-half who truly represent in a literary fashion

the spirit of the present-day Irish Revival. These do not merely bring Irish fashions and fanatasies into English literature, but stand facing forward through embattled mists—loving Ireland, serving her, and remaining ever hopeful. Ethna Carbery is one of their number. Many a person has voiced the thought, but none more directly, or more nearly applicable to our purposes, than a writer of the *New York Sun*, who remarked concerning some of Ethna Carbery's work: "Nothing in the new Irish Revival is more Irish than these books."

Lionel Johnson had this high courage for the cause of Ireland as no other writer of this century—Lionel Johnson, who dreamed of a "flaming and celestial way afar from our sad beauties," and who looked to see "some lightning glory fire the Gael." Ethna Carbery comes very close to him in her optimism and courage of patriotism, and she has the great advantage of being more truly Irish in other characteristics, of knowing the Irish life better, of really feeling the things which he had to learn. Though stirred by no deeper love and though holding no higher hope, she was in a position to know better than he the heart of the people of whom she wrote, and she has said:

. . . . Shiela ni Gara, why rouse the stony dead,  
Since at your call a living host will circle you instead?  
Long is our hunger for your voice, the hour is drawing near  
Oh, Dark Rose of our Passion-call, and our hearts shall hear!

The poem *Mo Chraoibhin Cno*<sup>2</sup> shows this patriotism in its highest mood and in it the poetess has linked past with future in a brave aspiration. The life of the Island breathes through its lines and wakes to action with the moving rhythm.

MO CHRAOIBHIN CNO!

A sword of light hath pierced the dark, our eyes have seen the Star:  
Oh Eire, leave the ways of sleep new days of promise are;  
The rusty spears upon your walls are stirring to and fro,  
In dreams they front uplifted shields—Then wake  
Mo Chraoibhin Cno!

<sup>2</sup> Mi chreeven no, "My cluster of Nuts"—"My brown-haired girl, i. e., Ireland.

Afar beyond that empty sea, on many a battle-place,  
 Your sons have stretched brave hands to death before the foeman's face—  
 Down the sad silence of your rest the war-notes faintly blow,  
 And bear an echo of your name—of yours  
 Mo Chraoibhin Cno!

The silver speech our father knew shall once again be heard;  
 The fire-lit story, crooning song, sweeter than lilt of bird;  
 Your quicken-tree shall break in flower, its ruddy-fruit shall glow,  
 And the Gentle People dance beneath its shade—  
 Mo Chraoibhin Cno!

There shall be peace and plenty—the kindly open-door;  
 Blessings on all who come and go—the prosperous or the poor—  
 The misty glens and purple hills in fairer tint shall show,  
 When your splendid Sun shall ride the skies again—  
 Mo Chraoibhin Cno!

There is one note of regret in the poems of Ethna Carbery, and yet it cannot be charged against her as meaning lack of faith. This note concerns the one thing against which all patriots most inveigh and for which all patriots must be sorrowful, the persistent emigration due to the hard life, poverty and frugality of the country. Many and many a time have Seumas McManus and others voiced opinions against the tendency in strong young men in Ireland to go out of the country in order "to push their fortunes in America." *The Passing of the Gael* is the title of one of the most powerful, and the subject of many, of Ethna Carbery's poems, and that she sorrows at this sapping of the strength of Ireland does not mean that she loses hope. She therein sees more need of urgent action.

*The Passionate Hearts* is the title of one of Ethna Carbery's books, a collection of stories which have appeared in various magazines. This title may be taken as indicative of the character of her love poems and tales of love. In them is high light or shadow, all of the wonder and the poetry of life amid hard work. Love is a powerful compelling force and a beautiful one. It ends in dreadful tragedy or in happiness eternal and complete; there is no middle ground. The people in her stories "love with a love that is more than love," and her conceptions are all highly idealized.

In the poems there is less of this ferocity and consuming

power of passion and more of the tenderness and delicacy of love. Some rather conventional retrospective verses on *Ann Hathaway* stand out as different from the rest of her work with a rich attractiveness about them. *Angus the Lover* is introduced in a poem of that title, he who ever pursues, "seeking the love that allures":

Thus she ever escapes me—a wisp of cloud in the air,  
A streak of delicate moonshine; a glory from elsewhere:  
Yet out in the vibrant space I shall kiss the rose in her face,  
I shall bind her fast to my side with a strand of her flying hair.

Her conception of love is strong and womanly, yet touched with the delicacy and sentiment of a poetess. The poem opening with the line "Set your love before me as a shield" is a noble expression of what love may mean to one who is loved and who loves deeply.

She looks the facts squarely in the face. Love is impulsive and strong, not weak and merely sentimental. The heart of the woman speaks with conviction and force:

Oh strong man! man of my love!  
With eyes of dreams,  
Pools of the dusk where move  
No starry gleams:  
Come from your storm-girt tower,  
Come to my side  
And sweetly your sheath of pride  
Shall break into flower.

When the arrow ends its flight  
You will lonely grow  
For a woman's kiss in the night  
And her breast of snow:  
You will reach your arms to the Dark,  
And call and cry  
As the winged winds sweep by—  
But no ear shall hear.

Then again:

Vein o' my heart, can you hear me crying  
Over the salt dividing sea?  
Maybe you'll think 'tis the wind that's sighing—  
But it comes from the Heart O' Me,  
The heart o' me.

Her lines are noble and inspiring; ennobling and beautiful when she speaks of love amid the beauties of nature in the Irish hills. To be sure, this is of the earth earthy; and yet even in what are strictly "love poems" we are often made to feel that he who loves is in touch with eternity, so high does her thought lift us from the common touch of common things. She is an idealist of a high order.

This is the work of Ethna Carbery. Whether she sings or writes of nature, of Irish hopes or of love, or whether, as in the piece on *Glen Maylena*, for instance, she combines all three—her work bears marks of distinct genius. She chose a limited field in which to write; she who could have done greater work in broader meadows of poesy, consecrated herself to the support of the cause she loved. Yet, here she found "Gold, the gold of a vision which angels cannot buy."

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**Heinrich Schumacher, Christus in seiner Praeexistenz und Kenose nach Phil. 2, 5-8. I Teil: Historische Untersuchung.** Rom: Verlag des Päpstl. Bibelinstituts, 1914. xxxii and 263 pp. Price, 4.50 Lire.

A few years ago the learned author of this excellent book published a splendid work on the famous passage Matth. 11, 22 (Luke 10, 22), a work which was praised everywhere, not only by Catholics, but also and almost even more by the best Protestant scholars, as a model of research and a study of the highest value. The book which is to be reviewed now and which deserves the same praise, is a kind of sequel to it, treating of the most important passage, Phil. 2, 5-8.

The aim of the indefatigable Dr. Schumacher in this work is to find out, whether the ideas of St. Paul on Christ are in opposition to those of the passage in Matthew and Luke spoken of just above or if they agree with them or even furnish a further development. In due appreciation of the innumerable difficulties of the exegesis of this passage the author endeavors first to establish the main interpretations it found from the first centuries up to the present among the Fathers, the ecclesiastical writers and exegetes, Catholic as well as Protestant. This research into the history of the interpretation is the subject of this first volume of his work.

Starting with the first century, he carefully establishes as an undoubted fact, that all the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers up to the fifteenth century and most of the famous exegetes of the later times up to the twentieth century agree in the following three points. First: the words *ἰπάρχων*, etc., suppose the preexistence of Christ; second: the word *μορφή* either means the divine nature or supposes it; third: the words *ἀρπαγμόν*, etc., emphasize the legitimacy of Christ's claiming equality with God. There are only two exceptions, Pseudo-Athanasius and the Ambrosiaster, who refer the *ἰπάρχων*, etc., to the life of Christ on earth and explain the *ἀρπαγμόν*, etc., by diverse hypotheses, but still hold, that *μορφή* means divine qualities supposing the divinity of Christ. This explanation of Pseudo-Athanasius and the Ambrosiaster



seems not to have any other exclusive representatives up to the fifteenth century until Luther resumes it and is followed from there on by quite a few exegetes, both Catholics and Protestants. An entirely different explanation was brought forth in the eighteenth century when Baur and after him many of the most modern critics, following Luther, refer the *ὑπάρχων*, etc., to the life of Christ on earth and explain the *ἀρπαγμόν* by different theories, but deny that in the *μορφή* any relation to the Godhead can be maintained at all.

The whole study excels because of its clearness and thoroughness. A special feature, due to the practical sense of the author is the graphic description at the end of the book by which the reader is enabled to catch the entire history of the exegesis of Phil. 2, 5-8 at a glance.

The language is splendid indeed, the author being a master of a powerful and plastic style. Also the external appearance of the book is good and will lend much credit to the Biblical Institute in Rome which has published it. The price is exceedingly low.

Dr. Schumacher's noble work, which opens the series of Dedications on the occasion of the twenty-fifth jubilee of the Catholic University of America, does honor to the University and is at the same time an effective proof of its helpful appreciation of modern research work in the right spirit, both truly scientific and conservative.

F. COELN.

**Alois Hudal, Die religiösen und sittlichen Ideen des Spruchbuches. Kritisch-exegetische Studie. Rom. Verlag des Päpstl. Bibelinstituts, 1914. xxviii and 261 pages. Price, 4,50 Lire.**

There is considerable controversy about the time in which the book of Proverbs was written. The traditional view which is commonly held by Catholic exegetes maintain that, if Solomon is not the author, its origin must nevertheless be dated back to his time or at least to the time before the exile. Most exegetes however, especially the Protestant and the rationalists, flatly deny this and claim that the postexilic period down to even the second century before Christ is the time when it came into existence. The arguments alleged to prove either opinion are based chiefly upon the

literary character of the book of Proverbs. The author holding that such literary proofs are doubtful because of the uncertainty of the text as shown by the great discrepancies between the Masoretic text and the versions, especially the Septuagint, and therefore practically useless, aims at establishing the exact conception of the "Weltanschauung" of the Proverbs, i. e., the general complex of religious and philosophical ideas fit to govern the life of the writer of the Proverbs and his time. The question arises whether this Weltanschauung is common to the Jewish people before the exile, or whether it is such that it can be explained only by supposing the influence of Greek ideas of later times.

In establishing the "Weltanschauung" found in the Proverbs the author treats in five chapters (each of which contains several subdivisions) of the religious ideas, the idea of the subjective Chokma, the idea of the objective Chokma, the ethical ideas and finally the eschatological ideas as contained in the book. After a comparative study of all these ideas, religious and otherwise, he reaches the conclusion that nothing in the Proverbs is found which must be considered as postexilic and so he deems it right to keep to the traditional view of the preexilic origin.

The author's studies, though not exhaustive, are very extensive and indicative of his zeal and painstaking application. His style however might generally be a little more direct and condensed here and there, also more correct. Many a foreign word might have been replaced by a better and more expressive German equivalent. But these few remarks and others which might be made touch upon only subordinate matters and should not take from the praise which the author well deserves.

The make-up of the book is good, although the printing is not always perfect, there being quite a few mistakes.

F. COELN.

---

**The First Twelve Chapters of Isaiah: A new translation and commentary.** By George S. Hitchcock. London, Burns and Oates, 1912. viii and 210 pages. Price, \$1.25.

The author presents in his work a new translation of the first twelve chapters of Isaiah with a commentary. He is certainly right, when he thinks that the importance of the subject will be questioned by no one, and also that there is no series of passages

better suited to introduce a student to the Old Testament problems of textual, documentary and exegetical criticism. But it may be said right here that it is regrettable that the author does not treat of the following chapters, especially in the so-called Deutero-Isaiah, because they are just as interesting and important and as well suited for critical studies.

In the translation Dr. Hitchcock aims to so render the prophecies as to present the meaning in a form approaching that of the original as nearly as possible. In this he succeeded very well, though in quite a number of passages a different translation might be more congruous. The commentary is sober and simple, but solid, refraining from far-fetched speculations. Generally he endeavors to establish his ideas of a passage by positive statement without refuting explanations contradictory to his. This method certainly has its advantages, but sometimes a digression would surely result in a better understanding of a passage or a deeper conviction of the correctness of his explanation. So, for instance, in explaining the most important passage, Is. 7, 14, there is scarcely a hint at the manifold attempts of modern critics to overcome the difficulties which any explanation presents. The author certainly is justified by Matth. 1, 23, the decision of the Biblical Commission, June 29, 1908, and constant tradition within the Catholic Church, in considering this passage only as a direct prophecy of the Virgin-birth of Christ by His blessed Mother, but we miss with regret—and I think everyone will—the refutation of the other explanations, and also the proof from the context, or otherwise, that just this conception of the passage has to be considered as the only possible or at least the most probable one. In spite of all efforts he fails to prove that “*almah*,” which, according to its etymology means “*adulescentula puber*,” and which in other Oriental languages is commonly used as an euphemism for prostitute and similar persons, can have only the one meaning of virgin in its strictest sense. There is furthermore no sufficient explanation of v. 15, etc., in spite of the fact that its sense is very much disputed. What we have said, however, of the author’s commentary on this point is not intended to imply that the commentary is insufficient. Some might be inclined to regard his method rather an advantage than otherwise. Dr. Hitchcock is not the only one who considers this positive method, avoiding the review and the criticism of contrary explanations as the only right and useful one; not less an

authority than Theodore Zahn purposely and consistently applies the same in his New Testament commentaries.

There is one thing in this small commentary I want to point out, namely, the constant adding of philological and historical references. In modern times and modern countries missionary work which, of course, is of the very greatest importance, wholly absorbs the great body of the clergy. No wonder that there arises the cry for a practical course in Theology as preparation for the ministry. But there are well founded reasons to surmise that this catchword "as practical as possible" in many cases becomes in meaning identical with "as little as possible" and consequently reduces the study of Scripture and the studies preparatory to it to such a minimum as to be entirely useless. And yet, Holy Writ always was, is, and must be the foundation and backbone of sound Theology, its most practical branches not excluded. A fruitful study of Holy Writ, however, supposes a fair knowledge of the Biblical languages and some acquaintance with Eastern history and culture. This very principle is adopted and consistently followed by the author who according to all evidence wrote his commentary not for such students who want to make a special study of Holy Writ, but for such priests who earnestly wish to reach a reasonable and solid understanding of the inspired word of God for practical purposes. And for this he deserves most emphatic thanks.

In conclusion I want to express the sincere hope that the author will present us with the translation of and the commentary on the rest of the book of Isaiah as soon as possible, wrought on the same principles as the one on the first twelve chapters. This commentary together with his work on "The Higher Criticism of Isaiah" would fit admirably in the library of every studious priest, no matter whether engaged in higher studies or in missionary work.

The make-up of the book is good, the price fair.

F. COELN.

---

**The Missions and Missionaries of California.** By Fr. Zephyrin Engelhardt, O. F. M. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Company, 1908. 3 vols.

The two thousand pages included in these volumes suggest, sometimes they relate in detail, the story of Franciscan activity in the two Californias. If one consider the apostolic labors of this order

in other quarters of the globe, one must clearly perceive that the preparation of a history of the followers of Saint Francis would be a work of no small magnitude. This task Father Engelhardt has not attempted. His theme, the *California Missions and Missionaries*, treats of only a single phase of Jesuit and of Franciscan endeavor. Yet in this aspect both are important and vast. The industry of fifteen years can not have sufficed for the completion of his undertaking, and it is more than probable that the author was the slave of his pen for twenty winters and the length of twenty long summers. If it is any consolation for all the self-denial implied in this programme, Father Engelhardt can have the assurance that he has prepared a work of great utility, of great interest, and of a high order of scholarship.

The *Introduction* mentions the founding in 1208 of the Order of Friars Minor, a missionary brotherhood more familiarly known as the Franciscans. The discovery of the New World opened up for its spiritual enterprise two boundless continents and a great archipelago, lands peopled by dusky multitudes. Early in their contact with the West Indies two friars furnished food for a band of Caribs, and, to show their impartiality, the savages also devoured a lay brother. Two years after the conquest by Cortés, Franciscans were preaching to his allies, the Tlascala Indians. In their seminaries the sons of Saint Francis were soon training men for the missions in New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, Florida, and California. When the followers of Pánfilo de Narvaez perished in their invasion of Florida, five Friars Minor shared the fate of nearly all his adventurous band. Nevertheless, other Friars came later, and of these fourteen met violent deaths at the hands of the natives.

One who knows nothing of the brotherhood founded by Saint Francis of Assisi is likely to imagine his disciples forever reading printed prayers, toiling over Indian declensions and conjugations, preaching as soon as they could speak one of the native dialects, instructing in the elements of Christianity and so on. All this they did, but they addressed themselves with enthusiasm to tasks which were very different. They gave seeds, cattle, and the implements of husbandry to their converts and instructed them in planting, harvesting, and building. Other missionaries penetrated into regions remote from civilization. By them were explored the sterile stretches of Arizona and New Mexico. In the generations

to come this fatal region was to witness the labors of three hundred and the martyrdom of two score Franciscans. After a brief summary the author discusses the missionary activity in Lower California.

When dame fortune, who sets up emperors and kings, had deprived Cortés of the wealth won in the conquest of Mexico, she led him into the peninsula of Lower California, a waste where few flowers then bloomed. It was in that desolate country that he had hoped to repair his broken fortunes and further to enlarge his fame. Perhaps he still dreamed of Indian empires. About the same time Cabrillo explored the coast beyond the limits of the present State of California. In the Spanish colonies missionary work went hand in hand with exploration. The school books tell of the Spanish thirst for gold, but they do not so often emphasize the hunger for the conversion of human souls.

After treating the voyage of Vizcaino the author describes the period of Jesuit activity, namely, the interval between 1679 and 1767. This section tells briefly of the founding of missions, of Indian massacres, of battles, of conspiracies, of cruel calumnies and withal of a devotion to apostolic duty little short of marvellous.

One comes early upon the record of official interference with the missionaries. In some epochs the instructions sent from Spain were remarkable for wisdom, but in their application to the Indians the good intentions of government were often turned awry. The counsellors of King Carlos III, however, were neither wise nor honorable, for they advised their monarch to an evil course. On June 25, 1767, a little before sunrise, the Viceroy of New Spain published a royal edict issued in the preceding February. That official was himself addressed in the following threatening terms:

"I invest you with my whole authority and royal power that you shall forthwith repair with an armed force—*á mano armada*—to the houses of the Jesuits. You will seize the persons of all of them, and despatch them within twenty-four hours as prisoners to the port of Vera Cruz, where they will be embarked on vessels provided for that purpose. At the moment of such arrest you will cause to be sealed the records of said houses, and the papers of such persons, without allowing them to remove anything but their breviaries and such garments as are absolutely necessary for the journey. If after the embarkation there should be found

in that district a single Jesuit, *even if ill or dying*, you shall suffer the penalty of death. *Yo el Rey* (I, the King)."

Don Francisco de Croix, the viceroy of New Spain, published next day an astounding edict, which provided, "*that the religious of the Company* [of Jesus] *priests as well as coadjutors or lay-brothers, who have made the first vows, and the novices who desire to follow them, shall be banished from all his dominions in Spain, the Indies, the Philippine Islands, and the other adjoining countries, and that all the property of the Company in his dominions shall be seized.*"

With consequences to us at once familiar and appalling the later rulers of much of Latin America have been accustomed to regard the frugal servants of the Church as fair game. For generations government officials in those countries have obtained their revenues not by laying and collecting taxes, but by the plunder of the defenceless. As one by one the stars vanish before the rising tempest so one by one in the savage American wilderness went out the hospitable rays that streamed from chapel or from mission-house.

In approving the inhuman sentence noticed above, the Marquis declared that he would see himself compelled to use the utmost rigor to impose silence on the voice of indignation in which outraged innocence might cry to heaven. Assemblies, conferences, talks, discussions might bring down upon the participants the military power of New Spain. Soldiers soon stood guard at the colleges of the Society, and when the Jesuits set out for Vera Cruz, acted as escorts. Thirty-four persons died from the hardships of this journey, nine succumbed at Havana, where they had sought a little repose, and others still hurried on to immortality before their arrival in Italy.

Yielding to the threats of the Bourbon kings, Pope Clement XIV dissolved the Society of Jesus in August, 1773. According to hostile historians the Jesuits have influenced the conduct of government in more than one European country. However that may be, in an unhappy hour for the welfare of their order and of the promising Indian civilization, they interfered in the domestic affairs of Louis XV. A Jesuit father had refused absolution to Madame Pompadour unless she broke off her scandalous relations with the immoral King. This disreputable woman then began to plot for the destruction of the entire Company. Her arts and her successes are topics familiar to readers of history. In 1764 the

Society of Jesus was suppressed in France. Flushed with success the Madame and her friends next sought and found a tool in the King of Spain. An ingenious forgery ascribed to the Jesuits drove that monarch to the verge of frenzy. His edict we have seen, but his desire for vengeance carried him still farther. For an account of the subsequent royal conduct the reader must consult a narrative of the Jesuits in North America. In its consequences history records few events more tragic than this interference by courtiers and courtesans with the sublime office of the missionary.

In 1767 by order of the Viceroy and the Inspector-General the Franciscans took up the burdens which the Jesuits had been forced to set down. For one who has not the leisure to read the splendid volumes of Father Engelhardt a hint of the nature of the work of the Franciscans in Upper California will be obtained by a perusal of Father Palou's life of Father Junipero Serra, his ecclesiastical superior, which was noticed in the *Bulletin* for the month of March, 1914. No library, Catholic or other, should be without a copy of Father Engelhardt's great work.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

---

**Studi sull' Estetica**, by Romualdo Bizzarri; Florence, Libreria editrice Fiorentina, 1914. Pp. 400.

Owing to the absence of a preface, of a conclusion, of headlines, and of an alphabetical index, it is difficult to indicate the purpose of this book and to analyze its contents. A number of things are found therein which pertain to many subjects, and which one would hardly expect to find under the present title. Yet perhaps this should not be surprising since subjectively the æsthetic feeling is in close relation to all other mental activities, and objectively the existence and nature of beauty is connected with the many philosophical problems on the nature of reality. After a few introductory chapters on present philosophical systems and tendencies, and on various psychological topics referring more or less directly to the æsthetic feeling, the author analyses the nature of beauty, its degrees, its relation in the human mind. Then he passes to art in general, its nature, its relations to science, and its divisions. On the subject of arts in particular, about 150 pages are devoted to poetry and rhetoric; only 40 to the others altogether. The last chapter deals with the criticism of works of art.



The author shows a marked sympathy for Scholasticism, and a general dislike for modern philosophy. But, while many good criticisms of some recent philosophical and æsthetic views are given, the discussion is sometimes marred by the use of epithets which, it is true, show the author's high disdain of those to whom they are applied, but add nothing to the strength of the argument. Nor are we quite sure that the views criticized are always exactly those of the writers to whom they are attributed. At times there seems to be some misunderstanding. These defects, however, do not prevent the work from being a useful one; and because it opens many problems, and offers many good suggestions and criticisms, it will interest the student of æsthetics.

C. A. DUBRAY.

---

**L'Enigma della Vita, e i nuovi orizzonti della biologia**, by Dr. Agostino Gemelli, O. M., Professor in the Royal University of Turin; Florence, Libreria editrice Fiorentina, 1914. Pp. xxviii-818.

The first edition of this work, in 1909, was received very favorably, and praised highly even by the opponents of the author's philosophical views. While following the same general plan, this second edition has been revised thoroughly, new chapters have been added, and the most recent scientific results have been taken into account. From 598 pages the book has been increased to 818. The author begins with a general survey of the field, describing the actual condition of biology, its tendencies, the value of the conclusions, and the relations between biology and philosophy. Then he considers successively the two central problems of the origin of life, and the nature of vital phenomena. Finally he endeavors to solve "the riddle of life," and, as the result of his study, is led to admit the definition of life given by St. Thomas: "Vivere est movere seipsum secundum aliquam speciem motus"; the two specific characteristics of vital activities being continuity and immanence.

On some points of detail there is room for difference of opinion, but, taken as a whole, this work is a splendid illustration of the true philosophical method, and, within its field, a proof of the vitality of Scholastic principles, and of their agreement with most recent empirical research. The scientific information is sure, abun-

dant, up-to-date, and offers a firm basis for the philosophical conclusions which rest on it. The philosopher finds in the text a clear and methodical presentation of the facts, and is thus enabled to follow the author's line of argument. The student of natural science finds in the foot-notes a wealth of references which may guide him toward a deeper research in the domain of biology. Readers of this work, be they friends or adversaries of neo-Scholasticism, will have to admit the author's fairness in dealing with facts and theories, and to reckon with his interpretations. The scientist will certainly see that science inevitably leads to philosophy, and the philosopher that philosophy must be deep-rooted in science. Both will be interested by Dr. Gemelli's book, and will derive great profit from reading and studying it. This work makes us await eagerly the more general studies which the author announces in the Preface, on a spiritualistic conception of the universe.

C. A. DUBRAY.

---

**Waninger, Dr. Karl. Der sozial Katholizismus in England.**  
Volkvereins-Verlag, M. Gladbach, 1914. Pp. 139. 1.85 M.)

This monograph is one of a series published by the Verein für das Katholische Deutschland. It presents both a brief account of the revival in England of the insistence on the application of true Catholic principles in industrial and social relations, and a summary of the present activities and programme of the resultant Catholic Social reform movement. To those acquainted with the admirable work of such English organizations as the Catholic Social Guild in promoting the study of industrial and social problems on the basis of sound guiding principles and in actively supporting voluntary and statutory measures for the betterment of the conditions of employment and of living of the wage-earning population, the chief value of this monograph lies in the suggestive historical outline of the teachings and influence of the leaders of English Catholic thought during the past century on the ethical aspects of economic relationships. But for those who are not in touch with the ideals and practical work of these organizations, the brief exposition of their aims and activities with which the monograph concludes is quite as valuable and stimulating.

The historical account occupies two-thirds of the monograph. The familiar facts as to the destruction of Catholic corporate organizations in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI and the gradual transition in economic policy from the social ideals of the Middle Ages to an economic individualism more in keeping with the individualistic tendencies in the theological thought of Protestantism are briefly recounted. The first counter force is found in the influence, greatly emphasized by the writer, which was exerted by the Oxford movement through its reaction against individualism in industrial as well as in religious matters and its harking back to the pre-Reformation insistence upon moral obligations in economic relations. A tremendous forward impulse was a little later given by the teachings and works of Cardinal Manning, and to these the author devotes relatively large space. Special mention is also made of the principles and proposals advocated by Archbishop Bagshawe of Nottingham. A few pages on the growth of like movements, based on Christian principles, in the Anglican church and within the non-conformist bodies conclude the historical résumé.

The fundamental principles on which the present day programme is based and the programme itself are set forth in outline at the beginning of the second division of the book and the remainder is given over to a description of the constitution, aims and activities of the several organizations included within the movement. The principles are marshalled from such writers as the late C. S. Devas, Mgr. Parkinson, and our own Rev. Dr. Ryan. The programme includes the establishment by law of minimum wage rates and the maximum number of hours of labor, the encouragement of trade unions and joint agreements between unions and employees, industrial training, improved housing and Poor Law reform. Among the organizations the fullest treatment is necessarily given the Catholic Social Guild, which was established in 1909 for the publication and distribution of social reform literature, for the promotion of the study of the social sciences, and for the general unification of Catholic effort for the improvement of industrial and social conditions. The reasons which called forth the organization of the Guild, its work, its rapid growth and the very encouraging results it has obtained are brought together here in convenient compass, largely from the Catholic Social Year Books and the Annuals published by the Guild itself.

There is little that is new in this monograph, nor does any sec-

tion of it present an exhaustive treatment of the topic dealt with therein, yet the book as a whole impresses us as well worth while as a clear synthetic presentation of an important series of activities for readers in other lands than the one described. It leads one to hope for a similar treatment in English of this movement, at least of its recent developments, for wide circulation among American Catholics. The monograph contains a bibliography and is well indexed.

DAVID A. McCABE.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

---

Card. D. Falconio. *I Minori Riformati negli Abruzzi*. Roma. Tipografia Nazionale, 1913-1914. 3 vols. Vol. I, pp. cviii + 282; Vol. II, pp. 391; Vol. III, pp. xiv + 524.

Almost thirty years have elapsed, Cardinal Falconio tells us, since he began to collect materials for the work before us: its completion has been retarded in consequence of the more immediate duties which have devolved upon His Eminence since 1884. And, indeed, the wonder is that the author could find time to continue and complete such a work at all in addition to his other manifold labors and activities. As its title implies, Cardinal Falconio's work deals with the history of the Franciscans in the Abruzzi. The first volume opens with an Introductory chapter in which, after describing (pp. xvii-xxiv) the origin of the Franciscan order, His Eminence discusses (pp. xxv-xlv) the Apostolate of the Friars Minor. He then (pp. xlvi-lxxxvii) gives a brief sketch of the history of the order with more special reference (1) to the division of the Friars into two great branches, known respectively as the Observants and the Conventuals, (2) to the new reform within the order called *La Piu Stretta Osservanza*, (3) to the union of the different families of the Observance under Leo XIII. This general outline is followed by an account (pp. xci-cviii) of the establishment of the Franciscans in the Abruzzi in 1215, and of the progress of the order there up to 1592. These introductory pages are full of interest and, though they contain little that is new, are really necessary to a proper understanding of the subject with which these volumes are more particularly concerned—the work of the *Riformati* or Friars Minor of the Strict Observance belonging to the Province of St. Bernardine in the Abruzzi.

The foundation of this famous province and its history from

1592 up to the time of the "general suppression" of 1866 is dealt with in the first volume (pp. 7-257), several documents of importance referred to in the text being given *in extenso* as an appendix (pp. 261-276). The second volume is divided into four parts. It contains I, a continuation of the history of the Province of S. Bernardine from 1866 till 1897 (pp. 7-215); II, historical sketches of the different priories of the Province from its foundation up to 1898 (pp. 221-300); III, a synoptic table of the Superiors who governed the Province in question from 1592 to 1897 (pp. 303-359); IV, a chronological list of all the Provincial Superiors in the Abruzzi from 1218 to 1914 (pp. 363-385). The third volume comprises (pp. 1-471) a series of biographical sketches of 203 friars belonging to the Province of St. Bernardine who became renowned for holiness or learning. As an appendix there is a succinct account of the principal Franciscan happenings through the Abruzzi from 1897 to the present year. There is also an excellent Index covering twenty-three pages and the thirty-five illustrations from photographs which adorn the work are admirably reproduced.

Such is a bare outline of the contents of the volumes before us which may well serve as models for other works of the same class. The Friars Minor in the Abruzzi have been fortunate, indeed, to find their historian in Cardinal Falconio who to a warm and loyal affection for his old Province, brings a rich store of well-sifted knowledge which he uses with judicious care. For the love and diligence His Eminence has expended on these volumes, he deserves the gratitude of all those who are interested in the subject of which they treat. In publishing the present work he has done a service and given an example which it would be unbecoming to forget. If similar books were written about the other religious orders in Italy, the task of the historian in that field would be much simplified.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

---

**The Mediæval Mind.** A History of the Development of Thought and Emotion in the Middle Ages. By Henry Osborn Taylor, Litt. D. In two volumes. Second edition. Macmillan and Co., 1914. Vol. I, pp. xvii + 603. Vol. II, pp. viii + 620.

For some years past, the yearly output of really informing work on the Middle Ages has been steadily increasing. And what is,

perhaps, the most encouraging sign of this upgrowth of interest in "Mediævalism," is the evidently more serious character of the work produced; for this shows both a praiseworthy enterprise on the part of the publishers concerned and a raising of the standard of interest amongst the reading public. The appearance of a second edition of Dr. Taylor's *Mediæval Mind*, which was one of the great successes of the year 1911, as a case in point. Of the many recent books which mark the revival of interest in "Mediævalism," it is hardly too much to say that this is the most suggestive as well as the most stimulating. Indeed, no other work that we can call to mind, published in English, surpasses the one before us as a help to the study of the tendencies and general trend of mediæval thought and life.

In his Preface Dr. Taylor insists that a realization of the power and import of the Christian Faith is needed for an understanding of the thoughts and feelings moving the men and women of the Middle Ages, and for a just appreciation of their aspirations and ideals. With this *proviso*, the author traces the development of intellectual energy and the growth of emotion through the Middle Ages and he does not stray from his quest after those human qualities which impelled the strivings of mediæval men and women, informed their imaginations, and moved them to love and tears and pity. In the nearest approach to popular form that such a subject admits, the volumes under review present a singularly discerning and dispassionate introduction to the study, not only of the mediæval mind, but also of what may be called the more informed and constructive spirit of the mediæval time.

We cannot deal here as completely as we could wish with this really important book. It must be enough to say that we give this new edition of Dr. Taylor's work a hearty welcome. The book has been carefully reconsidered throughout, and some statements have been changed or amplified. A new chapter has been introduced upon the Towns and Guilds and the Crusades, regarded as phases of mediæval growth. Taken as a whole, the *Mediæval Mind* is in every way worthy of its subject. It is a work of a type that is sorely needed and should take the place of much of the recent literature on Mediæval Europe which has but little to commend it except its good intentions.

PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### **Apostolic Letter of Our Holy Father, the late Pope Pius X, in favor of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Con- ception.**

Many thousands of Catholic women in the United States who have taken so generously to heart the great work of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at the Catholic University, will be delighted to read the beautiful apostolic letter of our late Holy Father, Pius X, given to Bishop Shahan on the occasion of his recent visit to Rome. When Bishop Shahan laid this great religious project before the Holy Father, in the presence of Cardinal Gibbons and other distinguished ecclesiastics, the Holy Father was visibly pleased and declared that not only would he commend the new Church to the generosity of the Catholic people of the United States, and particularly to all Catholic women, but that he would also be pleased himself to subscribe towards the erection of this splendid national monument. And he was as good as his word, for he was graciously pleased to hand to the Rector of the University the large sum of four hundred dollars as his personal gift towards the Shrine. On this occasion he encouraged greatly the Rector of the University to pursue steadily the completion of an edifice which would at once be a most noble monument in honor of Mary Immaculate, the patroness of the Catholic Church in the United States and of the University, and would also accommodate the growing student body of the University, while furnishing a religious center for the great public events, which now take place at the University with increasing frequency. Much interest attaches to this apostolic letter of Pius X, as it is probably one of the last great public documents to which he affixed his name. Following is the text of the letter.

To Our Beloved Son, James Cardinal Gibbons, of the title of  
Santa Maria in Trastevere, Archbishop of Baltimore.

Pope Pius the Tenth.

Beloved Son: Health and Apostolic Benediction;

Many pious Catholic women have by their intelligent zeal added another remarkable proof to the numerous evidences of active

charity which we so frequently receive from the United States. We have been informed that they have created an association for the collection of funds to build on the grounds of the Catholic University of America a church which shall foster the piety of the youthful students and meet the spiritual needs of the vicinity. How highly we esteem this project we need not say, since nothing could be more useful to the Church or further more helpfully the welfare of the republic. Both Church and State are, indeed, deeply indebted to those who guide the youthful minds at an early age to the places where it may be more fully and efficaciously imbued with that holy fear of God which is the beginning of wisdom.

It is most desirable, therefore, that all Catholics should promptly and generously contribute toward the happy completion of this Church, which so many praiseworthy Catholic women have undertaken. In this way will arise a masterpiece of religious architecture which will lift heavenward the minds of every student who enters it, make him thirst for wisdom from above, fill his heart with the same, and preserve it religiously while he lives.

May these holy prayers be heard through the Immaculate Mother of God, in whose honor it has been decided to build this church, and may her motherly eyes watch day and night over the Catholic University at Washington!

Meanwhile as a pledge of divine favor and of our benevolence, We give you, Beloved Son, the Association of ladies above mentioned, and your Clergy and faithful, with all Our heart, the Apostolic Benediction. Given Rome at St. Peter's, the 8th day of July, 1914, the 11th year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS X.

---

### **The New Sisters' College.**

With the erection of a residence for the Sisters of Divine Providence on Bates road between Sixth and Seventh streets northeast, now in course of construction, the foundation has been laid for the establishment in this city near the Catholic University of one of the most extensive institutions in the world for the higher education of sisters and women teachers in the Catholic Church.

It is estimated that one hundred buildings will be included in this cloistered city, which is calculated to give domicile in the future to about two thousand students, and is to cover a tract of



fifty-seven acres. Approximately \$1,500,000 will be the cost of the buildings, exclusive of fixtures, furnishings, etc. The institution will be known as the Sisters' College, and the plan has the sanction and blessing of the Pope.

The site of the proposed college touches the property of the Catholic University on the northeast and is separated from it by the Metropolitan Branch of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. The projected MacMillan boulevard connecting the District parks will, if present plans are carried out, run along the northern border of the university grounds and the southern end of the Sisters' College grounds.

The oblong tract of rolling country chosen as the site lends itself naturally to a division of the buildings into two groups, one of academic buildings approached directly from the boulevard, and the other group of community residences for the various religious orders.

In conjunction with both groups, there are minor divisions, one for the faculty of the Sisters' College, and one for the refectory and school of domestic science and administration. In addition there will be a small group of service buildings consisting of an electric power house and stables. Around the entire tract will be a high stone wall.

F. V. Murphy and W. B. Olmsted, the architects, have selected the Italian renaissance style for the academic group of buildings, and the Spanish mission style for the dwellings. The southern extremity of the tract, which has been selected for the academic group, is of sufficient elevation to give a magnificent view of the city. The chapel will be the dominant figure of this group and will cost approximately \$200,000. The other buildings, it is estimated, will cost between \$50,000 and \$75,000 each. Fronting them will be a heroic statue of the Virgin Mary.

The residences will be so arranged that they may be reached by the same approach as to the academic group. They will stand on a broad plateau surrounding an extensive campus.

It is proposed to use hollow tile or brick, with stucco finish, and to roof the buildings and porches with tiles of rich tones of red and deep green, which will blend harmoniously with the natural surroundings and the simple treatment of wall surfaces. Two large apartment houses will stand on opposite sides of the campus, and on each side of them extending around the campus

will be erected the smaller dwellings, each two stories high and containing accommodations for six or eight sisters.

As a protection against severe weather the subdivisions of community dwellings will be joined together by means of covered passageways in a way to create a complete cloister for each small group and enable secluded gardens to be laid out. In this manner it will be possible to isolate certain portions of the main group, while also making it possible to introduce a highly satisfactory scheme of landscape development.

---

#### **Commencement Exercises, 1914.**

The twenty-fifth annual Commencement of the Catholic University was held on Wednesday, June 17. His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, presided, and the address to the graduates was delivered by Hon. Hannis Taylor, former Ambassador of the United States to Spain. Degrees were conferred on 126 candidates, including the Doctorate in Philosophy which was received by Sister Mary Katherine of the Order of St. Benedict.

From the introductory statement made by the Vice-Rector, Very Reverend George A. Dougherty, we select the following items as indicating the growth of the University within the past year.

The flourishing condition of the University, on its material side, is obvious even to the casual observer. But this is simply the outward manifestation of the progress that has been made in its organization and its academic activity. Thanks to the earnest interest of His Eminence, the Chancellor, and to the untiring efforts of the Rt. Rev. Rector, the year that is closing has been the most prosperous in our history.

There has been a steady advance in the number of students, with the result that we now have 400 students registered in the schools of the University, and, including the Summer School and the affiliated colleges, a grand total of 1,175. This increase in the number of students has naturally entailed a corresponding increase in the number of instructors, so that the teaching staff now includes 72 instructors and professors.

I take this occasion to thank the professors and instructors of the University for their zealous attention to the regular work of the Departments, for their co-operation in other lines of activity,

whereby the University is extending its influence to all our Catholic schools and is taking its part in the general progressive movements of higher education in the United States.

I take pleasure in announcing the following promotions and appointments.

Dr. Frank O'Hara has been advanced from the position of instructor in economics to that of Associate Professor of the same subject.

Rev. Patrick J. McCormick from instructor in Education to that of Associate Professor of the same subject.

Dr. Francis J. Hemelt from instructor in English to Associate Professor of same subject.

Mr. George A. Weschler from instructor in Mechanical Engineering to that of Associate Professor of same subject.

The following instructors were appointed during the past year: Rev. Sigourney W. Fay, in Liturgy; Rev. Paschal Robinson, O. F. M., in Mediaeval History; Rev. Dr. Henry Schumacher, in Sacred Scripture; Rev. George M. Sauvage, in Psychology; Mr. James Hartnett, in English; Mr. Leo Behrendt, in German; Mr. Thomas H. Carter, in Electrical Engineering; Mr. M. X. Wilberding, in Mechanical Engineering, and Mr. Albert Bibb, in Architecture.

For the coming year, I wish to announce the appointment of Rev. Filippo Bernardini, S. T. D., Instructor in Canon Law; of Rev. Peter Guilday, Instructor in Ecclesiastical History; George J. Brilmeyer, in Biology; Mr. Henry E. McCausland, in Civil Engineering, and of Mr. Frank X. Burda, in Physics.

It will be of interest to note that the work undertaken by the University in behalf of our teaching communities has grown to such an extent during the past three years that the Trustees of the University felt justified in giving what was hitherto known as Teachers College a distinct organization and incorporation, in consequence of which this institution, with its Board of Directors, is henceforth to be known as the Catholic Sisters' College. In this connection it is my pleasing duty to express the thanks of the University for the hospitality and many kindly actions of the Sisters of St. Benedict, on whose grounds the College has been located from the beginning.

On the material side you have doubtless noticed various signs of improvement. I refer specifically to the new structure which is to serve as a Dining Hall and also as residence for graduate stu-

dents. Quite near this new building you will see the foundation now being laid for a Chemical Laboratory. This new building is by no means a luxury. It is a pressing necessity, arising out of the fact that the rooms in this Hall, hitherto occupied by the Department of Chemistry, are altogether inadequate. The University has found itself obliged to provide accommodation for the growing number of students who include chemistry in their course of study.

Another very urgent need, a need that has been felt for many years, will soon be supplied. I have in mind the University church, which is to serve not only as a place of worship for the members of the University, but also as a National Shrine in honor of Our Blessed Lady, under the special title of her Immaculate Conception. It has been very gratifying to observe the widespread enthusiasm with which the announcement of this project was received. From all parts of the country there has come a hearty response to our appeal for funds, both from clergy and laity, and, what is still more encouraging, the very mention of a National Shrine in honor of the Blessed Virgin has called forth extraordinary manifestations of faith and devotion and reverent love to the Mother of God. The Holy Father himself, on learning of this plan from the Rt. Rev. Rector, spontaneously gave a splendid contribution, which is a tangible and unmistakable expression both of his zeal for the honor of our August Patroness and of his paternal interest in the welfare of the Catholic University. It is fitting on this occasion that we should return our thanks to the Sovereign Pontiff for his generous aid and for the many marks of good-will that he has given to the University. The task of collecting the necessary funds has been taken over by the Catholic ladies of the United States, and is being steadily accomplished. To them, and to all who have contributed to this holy work, I desire in my own name and in that of the Rt. Rev. Rector to offer the tribute of our gratitude.

Among other marks of distinction that have come to the members of the University during the past year, I single out with pleasure the fact that Dr. Daniel W. Shea, O'Brien Professor of Physics in this University, presided at the meeting of the Association of American Universities, which was held in November last at the University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill. One might well say that this Association embodies the highest ideals of American education and it was, therefore, extremely gratifying that the position

of Presiding Officer should have been held by a representative of the Catholic University.

In this same connection I would like to note that the Rev. Paschal Robinson, of the Franciscan Order, Instructor in Mediæval History in this University, was invited by the University of Oxford to deliver an address at the Seventh Centennial Commemoration of the great Philosopher and Scientist, Roger Bacon, on June 9. There is thus established a link between one of the oldest universities of Europe and one of the youngest in the New World.

As I have already stated, there has been a marked increase in the student body; young men have come to us because they knew that this was best place to get the instruction and training that they needed. But a large body of graduates has been secured during the last few months through the generous action of the Knights of Columbus in establishing 50 graduate scholarships by an outlay on their part of \$500,000. This magnificent contribution to the work of the University is abundant evidence of the profound and intelligent interest which is taken by the Knights in higher education. As you are well aware, the Knights had already established a Chair in American History in this University, and now by this splendid donation they have widened out the opportunities of Catholic young men to pursue courses of study leading to the highest academic degrees. Not only the University but the Catholic body at large is deeply indebted to the Knights for this splendid proof of their far-seeing generosity.

Equal acknowledgment is due to the noble Catholic layman, Mr. Theodore B. Basselin, of Croghan, N. Y., who in the last days of his earthly life made the University his heir, transferring to it the fortune which he had accumulated through years of labor. This he did with full deliberation and clear consciousness of the purpose which he desired to see realized for the benefit of our Catholic clergy. Basselin College will be a fitting monument to the zeal of a man who loved the Church above all things and who was anxious that the salutary teachings of our holy faith should be brought home to the people in the most effectual manner.

In a like spirit of gratitude the University acknowledges the receipt of the following donations:

Mrs. S. M. Heraty, Philadelphia, Pa., Shrine....	\$500.00
Mr. G. L. Duvall, New York, Shrine.....	500.00
Estate James Farrel, Boston.....	800.00

Jas. J. Ryan, Philadelphia, Pa., Shrine.....	\$ 1,000.00
Henry Cornet Estate, St. Louis.....	1,000.00
J. Pierpont Morgan, New York.....	2,300.00
Thomas O'Neill, Baltimore, Chemical Laboratory	5,000.00
Miss Cath. A. Sullivan, Boston, memory brother.	5,000.00
Estate Richard Huncheon, La Porte, Ind.....	7,287.78
Estate Patrick Garvan, Hartford, Conn.....	10,000.00
Friend, for Dining Hall.....	15,000.00
Estate Charles B. Kenny, Pittsburg.....	20,000.00
Kn'ts of Columbus (Endowm't 50 Scholarships)	500,000.00
Estate Theodore Basselin, N. Y.....	500,000.00

---

\$1,068,387.78

I take pleasure in closing this list of benefactors by recording a gift of exceptional value and at the same time a proof of the growing practical sympathy which our people are taking in each Department of our University work. Some months ago a distinguished jurist of the State of New Hampshire passed away, leaving a most valuable library which he had accumulated in the course of a long and successful practice. Thanks to the good-will of his daughters, the Misses Mitchell, that library has been donated to the University and is to be known as the Judge John M. Mitchell Law Library.

I take this opportunity to thank these ladies for their generous action and to assure them that not only the professors and students of law but all the members of the University and the Board of Trustees appreciate deeply this gift whereby the study of a most important subject is furthered in a very substantial manner.

In the same Department of the University we are indebted to one of our leading Trustees, Mr. Walter George Smith, of Philadelphia, and to a group of Catholic gentlemen, acting under his inspiration, for a complete collection of the Law Reports of the State of Pennsylvania. These volumes, over 300 in number, will prove of incalculable service to our students of law, and the munificent action of the donors will undoubtedly serve as an example to be imitated by Catholic lawyers in every State in the country.

I have already made mention of the new buildings which are rising on the grounds of the University. I should now like to add that the oldest building on these grounds will shortly be vacated, for the very good reason that the present occupants, the Paulist Fath-

ers, are erecting a new Hall within a short distance of the University. The Paulists, I may say, were the first religious body to affiliate with the University. Since 1889 they have occupied the old Middleton Manor directly east of this building, and their students have been assiduous attendants at our University courses. We feel that the Paulists are fully entitled to their new home with its modern equipment and conveniences, and I trust that the Divine Blessing will rest upon them to the furtherance and the success of their genuinely apostolic purpose.

Amid these evidences of internal activity, I must not forget the various directions in which the University is reaching out into the world beyond its gates. During the past three years we have conducted on these grounds a Summer School for the members of our various teaching communities. These Sisters consecrate their lives to the work of Catholic education in the primary and secondary schools. They plant, as it were, the germ whose later development is to appear in the Catholic man and woman. They are, I may truly say, the original sources whence the University is to draw its students. From all those who have so far attended the Summer School we have received expressions of their deepest gratitude for the benefit conferred on them by the instructors of the University. Last summer the attendance reached and even surpassed the accommodations which the University could afford in the way of residence. It was therefore no matter of regret when one of our trustees, the Most Reverend Archbishop of Dubuque, invited us to duplicate our Summer School by giving parallel courses in his Cathedral City. Here again in this request of the Archbishop we have evidence of the intelligent appreciation on the part of the hierarchy of what the University is doing for our teaching communities.

Conjointly with this expansion, I mention with pleasure the progress of our scheme for affiliating Catholic High Schools and Colleges. Institutions now affiliated with the University, and therefore under its direct influence, number seventy-four. They are located in almost every section of the United States, and, as we know from the examination papers which have been sent to the University, they are doing excellent work with their pupils, and, what is more important, they are turning the minds of the people at large towards the Catholic University. Once this affiliation is thoroughly organized, the University will be able to count upon a body of undergraduate students in accordance with its own

standards. By this means also we are reaching out to all classes of our people and making some return to the generous men and women to whom we owe so much of our prosperity.

Closely connected with this sphere of activity—in fact, the very centre of it all—is the organization and growth of the Catholic Sisters' College to which reference has already been made and in which the chosen representatives of the different religious communities are fitting themselves both for the University degrees and for the applications of the best educational methods in their own schools.

While the first and most natural tendency of the University is to help our Catholic educational institutions, it has also in view those larger needs of the Catholic body which come home to us under the sweet name of Charity. Years ago the first Convention of Catholic Charities was held in this Hall. During the course of this Summer the same convention will assemble here to discuss the various and intricate problems which inevitably attend the work of helping our poor and needy members. Through the indefatigable activity of Rev. Dr. Kerby the work of the convention has been full organized, and we may rightly expect from its deliberations some practical results in that field wherein the Catholic Church has always taken the foremost place.

I have already spoken of the Holy Father's good-will with regard to the University; let me now add an item which will show another phase of his benevolence. Word has come to us that Rt. Rev. Mgr. Patrick J. Hayes, an Alumnus of this University, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of New York, has been elevated by the express will of the Holy Father to the dignity of the Episcopate. We extend to Monsignor Hayes our heartfelt congratulations, with the hope that in his new sphere of duty he will obtain that success which is the natural inheritance of each and every alumnus of the University.

I have thus presented in brief form the salient features of our progress during the past academic year. That much of this improvement is due to the professors and instructors of the University will be apparent to you all, and I am glad to express in the name of the Trustees and the Rector our cordial appreciation of what they have done.

I would mention especially their loyalty in co-operating with the Right Reverend Rector and of carrying out his designs for the development of the University. It has been a year of hard



work; new problems have confronted us, unexpected tasks have been set before us, and I note with much gratification the willingness of every instructor in the University to do his share in solving these problems.

That the work has been well done is evidenced by the results as these appear in the Academic Degrees that are shortly to be conferred.

But there is a stronger expression of approval, and that from the highest source. The Holy Father, in view of the zeal, the efforts, and the practical success obtained by Monsignor Shahan, has been pleased to elevate him to the Episcopal rank. This well deserved promotion will afford great pleasure to the numerous friends of Bishop Shahan throughout the United States. From all sides there has come a unanimous expression of gratification, while within the University itself there is a general rejoicing both for the reward bestowed upon the Rector and for the honor therein implied to the whole University. Although the details of his consecration are not yet arranged, we all look forward with pleasure to the time when we as professors and students will be able to offer our congratulations to Bishop Shahan, our well-beloved Rector.

In his name, for I am sure if he were present he would express the idea, I offer my sincere congratulations to the successful candidates for degrees, and I trust that each of them, as he leaves the University, will feel that he carries with him and that he is personally responsible for the good name of his Alma Mater from which he is about to receive the formal mark of Academic distinction.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Consecration of the Right Reverend Rector.** The Consecration of the Right Reverend Rector as Titular Bishop of Germanicopolis will take place in Baltimore on Sunday, November 15.

---

**Father Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.,** Lecturer on Medieval History has been elected Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

---

**Solemn Opening.** On Sunday, October 4, the Mass of the Holy Ghost was celebrated in the Chapel of Gibbons Hall, the Right Reverend Rector officiating. After the Mass the oath of office was taken by all the instructors, and an appropriate address was made by the Right Reverend Rector.

---

**Improvements.** Many improvements have been made at the University for the coming year. The new dining hall and dormitory has been completed, and in this building, which is one of the most attractive on the campus, all of the students who won the Knights of Columbus Scholarships, will be quartered.

Saint Thomas College (formerly the Paulist House of Studies) has been thoroughly renovated, and in the coming session will be used as a dormitory for some fifty lay students.

The new chemical laboratory, which was erected at a cost of \$150,000, will be ready for occupancy by October 1st, when classes are resumed. This laboratory is equipped in the most scientific and thorough manner, and makes provision for 500 students.

Owing to the removal of the chemical laboratory to its new

quarters, a great enlargement of the Biological and Architectural departments has been permitted, which will for the present share between them the space formerly taken up by the Chemical laboratories.

The library of the Law School has been enriched by the addition of several thousand volumes, making it one of the finest of its kind in this country.

---

**The Student Body.** The Catholic University of America is growing more and more as the years come and go, and when the academic year of 1914 commences, it is with the largest student body ever within her walls.

The freshman class will number over two hundred, making a total registration of over four hundred students, representing thirty States in the Union. In this number will be the first incumbents of the Knights of Columbus Scholarships. The growth of this great institution of learning is at once apparent, when consideration is given to the fact, that about four years ago, the University had about fifty lay students.

Added to the lay student body of over 400, there will be 250 ecclesiastics, secular and religious.

The student personnel is not confined exclusively to those of Catholic faith, for we find among those enrolled members of families of other denominations, who desire that training and environment for their sons, which they are sure a Catholic institution such as the University will surely give.

---

**The Teaching Staff.** The following members of the faculty, who on account of the war in Europe will not return are Professor Xavier Teillard, B. L., Instructor in French; Rev. George M. Sauvage, C. S. C., Ph. D., S. T. D., Instructor in Psychology.

The new instructors added to the faculty for the coming year are: Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph. D., Instructor in Ecclesiastical History; Rev. Filippo Bernardini, J. U. D., Instructor in

Canon Law. Father Bernardini is a nephew of Cardinal Gaspari, and comes to take the place of Very Rev. John T. Creagh, who is now pastor of Saint Aidan's parish, Brookline, Boston, Mass.

Harry Edward McCausland, B. S., Instructor in Civil Engineering, (University of Penna., 1914); George Joseph Brilmeyer, B. S., Instructor in Biology, (Alma College, 1913); Frank Xavier Burda, B. S., Instructor in Physics, (Catholic University of America, 1914); Leo Behrendt, Instructor in German.



# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XX.*

*December, 1914.*

*No. 9.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—*St. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit.* c. 6.*

---

PUBLISHED BY  
**THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA**  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

**J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.**

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XX.*

*December, 1914.*

---

*No. ~~4~~*

## IMPORTANT NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

---

With this number the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN completes its twentieth volume and brings to a close its career as a University publication of miscellaneous content. Beginning with the next month it will appear as a general informational periodical, devoted solely to the daily life and to the current work of the University. The need of such a monthly bulletin has manifested itself strongly during the recent development of the University; and it is hoped that, in its new field of service, the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN will commend itself to a much wider circle of readers and make better known the nature of our work and the measure of realization which the years have brought with them.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN will continue to appear as usual, under the same name, and will give to its already large number of readers desirable information concerning the University Schools, the work of the different Departments, and the intellectual life of the University in general. Whatever interests the Catholics of the United States in the academic life of the University will be chronicled in the pages of this new BULLETIN. There is no dearth of material to satisfy the intense desire of many to keep abreast of the growth of our great central institution of learning. The new BULLETIN will be illustrated, and will collect in its pages all necessary sources and materials for the proper history of the University, when the time comes for its preparation. The BULLETIN will also



serve to make known the growing needs and possibilities of the large educational plant which the Catholic Church in the United States now possesses at Washington. In this way, a steady communication will be kept up with the Catholic clergy, with thoughtful and generous Catholic men and women, who are interested in the work of higher education under Catholic auspices, with our ever-increasing number of benefactors, and with the scattered members of the vast Catholic flock which knows only in a vague way of the important and vigorous Catholic school, which has grown up at Washington.

The new BULLETIN will be sent gratis to all our old subscribers, to all the Pastors in every diocese of the United States, to our benefactors, and generally to all who desire to receive it.

This important change has been forced upon us by the growth of scholastic activity during the recent years; for some time past, it has been evident that the general work done in the BULLETIN ought to be divided up among the different schools, and the need of more specialized Reviews, particularly for the Departments of Theology, Philosophy, Social Sciences, and Ecclesiastical History, has been long felt by many. The auspicious occasion of the approaching twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the University, seems propitious for this new development of the academic life of the University.

It is proposed, therefore, to begin with the publication of a CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, for the study of American Catholic Ecclesiastical History. There exists no national publication, dealing with our domestic ecclesiastical history as a whole, and along the lines of the best modern training and equipment. The new REVIEW will be published quarterly, under a board of editors, consisting of the Rev. Drs. Turner, Healy, Robinson, Weber and Guilday. Its scope will be fourfold: Articles, Book-Reviews, Chronicle, and Bibliography, based upon the methods employed in such important publications as the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, and the RÉVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLESIASTIQUE of Louvain. The two great *desiderata* for workers in the field of American Church History,—a complete guide to the sources and materials thereof, and a complete collection of published documents,—will in this way be

### *IMPORTANT NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS*

gradually realized. Provincial, diocesan, and parochial history, also the history of the religious orders and congregations of the United States, will be given adequate treatment.

A Prospectus is being prepared to this effect and will be sent out not only to our old subscribers but to the priests of the country in general. If the returns warrant the inception of the project, the first number of the *CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW* will be published in April next. The subscription price of the new *REVIEW* will be three dollars a year, and it is hoped that all the old subscribers to the *BULLETIN* will continue their support of this new University periodical. No more important work needs to be done to-day than to create a central national publication where the Ecclesiastical history not only of the United States, but also of Canada and of Central and South America, will receive that scientific attention it has long needed. The time is ripe for such a *REVIEW*. It will increase the love of American Catholics for Holy Church in the United States, nor can its patriotic value be overestimated. Already the project has received the approbation of several of our bishops, and the editors anticipate the pleasure with which such a scientifically popular magazine will be received by the Catholic people of our country.

**THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN.**

## WASHINGTON, HIS ALLIES AND HIS FRIENDS.

---

From all the verse that since his death has dropped from poets' pens a little industry and taste might prepare a beautiful anthology on the genius and character of George Washington. From the fine holiday orations pronounced by the eulogists of one hundred and eleven years, one might select specimens of rare eloquence. This discourse will furnish, however, neither illustrations of the fine frenzy of the poet nor the purple patches of the orator. It will be chiefly an historical account of Washington, his friends, and his allies.

To-day we are assembled in this University to do honor to the memory of the principal founder of our favored republic. We have come hither to observe the one hundred and seventy-ninth anniversary of his birth, an event that, beyond question, changed the course of history. We are come hither to affirm our fealty to freedom's greatest champion, and this profession of our allegiance is in perfect harmony with the ancient spirit of our faith. Oftentimes one sees in books and quiet questions the implication that Catholics are new worshippers at liberty's fair shrine. A more particular examination of this interesting theme must be adjourned to a later occasion. For the present it will, perhaps, be sufficient barely to suggest a few fundamental considerations.

In the English-speaking world civil liberty is far older than the eventful reign of Queen Elizabeth; in "Merry England" it was enjoyed by prince and peasant before the revolt of Luther. Long ere men beheld the risen sun of the renaissance, liberty's mild light had cheered the humble and the proud; its antiquity carries the mind back through the long wars of Lancaster and York, beyond Barnet Heath and Bosworth. Before the seers and the soldiers of Wales first confronted the conquering Edward, Englishmen enjoyed liberty. Those stern warriors who followed the third Edward to the immortal field of Crécy were familiar with freedom. Still earlier, when Eng-

lish kings were also dukes of Normandy, yeoman as well as baron knew his rights. There is no rusty link in this lengthening chain that connects the restless present with the distant past. When dukes of Normandy became kings of England, the dawn of liberty was breaking in Britain.

In the reign of Henry I the plain people of England were promised a restoration of those political institutions that were affectionately connected with the enlightened rule of Alfred the Great. This guarantee might be regarded as the *little* charter, and, indeed, it is sometimes so styled. In the memorable reign of King John the armed barons met their obstinate ruler at Runnymede and forced him to sign the Magna Charta. To Englishmen the year 1215 is as familiar as, to us, is that of 1775. It is from Runnymede that they date the beginning of their civil liberty, and it was there that they began to shape their splendid constitutional edifice. The mitred Langton is still venerated in Britain, and in every quarter of the globe where England's sons are found. Like that great ecclesiastic all the early architects of constitutional freedom knelt at Catholic altars. No, Catholics are not new worshipers in freedom's temple. In England they built it, and they consecrated it, and when, like a tempest, the spirit of the Reformation swept over the island, that grand memorial of Catholic days still stood conspicuous, unscathed, and unremoved.

Why are we Catholics commemorating the birthday of George Washington? Because we are American citizens and we are proud of his achievements; because the members of our faith were the earliest and the most serviceable of his allies, and finally, because we are interested in humanity and in all its benefactors. While her greatness continues, America will not lack either friends or admirers. Catholics were interested in this nation when it was perilous to declare their friendship, and if, in the day of her unparalleled power and prosperity, they deem it appropriate to renew the memory of the epoch-making events of her early history, no patriot will question their motives.

These vast continents were made known to the world by a great Catholic navigator commissioned by the rulers of a great

Catholic nation. It is not now the custom in our country to say much in praise of Castilian achievement, but, to borrow the fine phrase of the poet, this is a custom better kept in the breach than the observance. We do not, it is true, falsify the chronicles of time, or deny the existence in them of deeds of noble note: we simply ignore them. "Thou shalt not bear false witness," says the divine injunction. Its observance is easy: "I shall bear witness neither false nor true. Of those historic glories I shall utter no syllable." Almost to the present moment this has been the complaisant policy of our most trusted guides. Ignore the beginnings of American history! As well might we try to ignore the pyramids that for three thousand years have looked out upon the level sands of the Sahara. Truth was not given prisoner to finite man. Its luminous records flame forever in the firmament of time.

One epoch-making event, the discovery of America, would of itself have sufficed to fill the chronicle of fame. Spanish enterprise, however, accomplished other deeds of scarcely less renown. Her navigators traced the outline of these immeasurable lands; they opened up to the commerce of Europe the trade of the boundless Pacific: they

"were the first that ever burst  
Into that silent sea."

In very truth, *they* were the ancient mariners. Lest there might still remain a doubt concerning her maritime supremacy in all the ages, Spain added another triumph by circumnavigating the globe. Her zealous missionaries endeavored to Christianize the aborigines of two continents and multitudes of other natives of mighty archipelagos in the East and in the West. She transplanted civilization into the forests of the two Americas, and, finally, the Spanish Government and the Spanish colonists contributed to the independence of the United States. These, indeed, are reasons why Catholics should be interested in Latin-America. Are there any reasons why they should be interested in what once was English America? We shall see.

Italy, the enlightened nation that trained in seamanship all

the navigators of the grand epoch of discovery gave the Cabots to England as she had given Columbus and Vespucci to Spain, and, as, a little later, she was to give Verrazzano to France. And what were the services of Giovanni Caboto? Even before Columbus had discovered the Southern Continent John Cabot had touched the northern one and had followed patiently its winding coast far to the southward. He it was who gave to England, then ruled by Henry VII, her last great Catholic king, a claim to this entire continent. When the storm of the Reformation had a little abated, England made good this claim by force of arms, contending successfully against the Spaniards and the French, the Swedes and the Dutch. In a word, while England was yet Catholic, and while a Catholic navigator was still permitted to command an English fleet, there was revealed to the civilized world the grand theatre for the future exploits of George Washington. Though this was much, Catholics have still stronger reasons for their affection for English America.

The American Revolution was the culmination of a party struggle that had long been in progress on both sides of the Atlantic. The Whigs, whether English or American, were endeavoring to diminish the power of the king; the Tories, both English and American, would preserve that power unimpaired. This familiar fact will serve to explain why, even after Lexington and Bunker Hill, many English and many Irish officers of the Whig persuasion sold their commissions in the army and retired to civil life. The Scottish officers generally continued to serve: the North Britons had become more English than the English themselves. Even the plain people of England, under the spell of the oratory of Barré and Burke and Pitt, cared little for service in America. This condition it was that led King George III to apply to the Empress of Russia for troops to subdue his rebellious subjects in America. In a very interesting communication his request was firmly refused. It was then that he made his arrangements with several of the smaller German States for Waldeckers, Brunswickers and Hessians. They were his principal reliance until France joined in the war during the year 1778. Thenceforth the English people took a new interest in the struggle, for it had ceased to be a

civil war; it had become a public war, and France, their ancient enemy, was taking an important share in the contest. With Whig as well as Tory the sentiment then became "Our country right or wrong."

Americans of that era knew, indeed, something of the magnitude of their undertaking. They were aware that they were engaging in war with a power that had wrested from France the fairest parts of India and of America, a power that after February, 1763, had become arbiter of Europe and mistress of the seas. This they knew. They did not know that to support what would, probably, be a protracted war they were wretchedly prepared. They were without adequate equipment for their army; they had no navy and no efficient system of public finance. Nevertheless, they did what in similar situations gallant men had done before; they refused to listen to the suggestions of prudence and resolutely faced the consequences of war. In its large outlines the story of the American Revolution is familiar to us all. On its great campaigns, therefore, we need not linger. It will be enough that we touch upon them briefly.

To gain the support of our neighbors on the North, Congress commissioned three eminent public characters, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Chase and Charles Carroll of Carrollton, to proceed to Canada. With them, as a volunteer, went Father John Carroll, destined to become the first Archbishop of Baltimore. That mission accomplished little, for the Canadians believed that, under England, they were enjoying a measure of religious freedom which, perhaps, would not be granted them by the States. Then came the disastrous invasion of that country. The story of failure at Quebec, and the horrors of the succeeding retreat are too familiar to require description.

As a part of England's plan to divide the States along the line of the Hudson two counter invasions were begun. One was checked at Oriskany Falls and Fort Stanwix, the other at Saratoga. The tidings of that great victory soon reached Europe. It added weight to the representations of Franklin, and France, which had long been giving secret assistance, openly concluded to support the cause of the colonists. In February, 1778, the young republic made her first treaty.

After the overthrow of his army in Long Island, Washington set out to protect the capital at Philadelphia. Then began a second campaign, the struggle for the possession of the Delaware. That ended at Trenton and Princeton.

While in the East these and subsequent events were dragging their weary length along, Colonel George Rogers Clark invaded the great West and with two companies captured Kaskaskia on July 4, 1778. In that community he found little difficulty in winning the confidence of Father Pierre Gibault, the mild monarch of the prairie settlement. In that town and in Cahokia he succeeded in recruiting two additional companies. Thus reinforced, Colonel Clark led his men in mid-winter through the "drowned lands" of the Wabash, and after enduring hardships seldom paralleled in military history took the British garrison at Vincennes and menaced the British occupation of Detroit. On this grand exploit one could linger with pleasure, but our theme is a vast one and we must follow rapidly the movements of the main armies. Before doing so, however, it should be added that no braver band ever went forth to fight than the little battalion that Clark led out from his native State of Virginia. Nevertheless, they could scarcely have succeeded without the coöperation of that enthusiastic recruiting officer, Father Gibault, and the treasure of François Vigo, another Latin resident of the Illinois country. For that generous loan to Colonel Clark, Congress, in 1876, paid \$50,000 to the speculators who had purchased the claim of Vigo's heirs. A tardy reimbursement, it is true, but still a substantial recognition of services rendered in a time of need. The exploits of Clark have never been fittingly described. Distinguished public men, indeed, have given us different versions of the march through "the drowned lands." A former candidate for the Vice-Presidency and a recent President of the United States have told, each in a very interesting manner, the story of the winning of the West, but this is not a subject for pedestrian pens; it is a theme of epic grandeur. In that brilliant campaign Catholics had a distinguished share.

What sustained General Clark during this terrible ordeal? More than anything else the assurance that, in case of disaster,



a haven of refuge could be found with the Spaniards beyond the Mississippi, and a belief that the Spaniards of New Orleans would remain constant in their friendship. It was no trifling matter to measure swords with Great Britain, but Spain did, nevertheless, in 1779, declare an independent war. Later she loaned the United States the sum of \$174,017. But her great assistance was not this timely loan. From the very beginning of the Revolution, the Spaniards of New Orleans had been extremely serviceable. The letters of Oliver Pollock, a Baltimore merchant then residing in Louisiana relate circumstantially the friendly acts of Bernardo Galvez, the brilliant young Spaniard commanding in the region of the Gulf. These interesting documents have never been published and at this moment are enjoying an uninterrupted repose in the Library of Congress. In the two Floridas, Galvez captured all the British posts. In the Honduras country and elsewhere in the tropics 5,000 British soldiers and sailors found hospitable graves.

The Dutch island of St. Eustatia, in the West Indies, played a very interesting part in the Revolution. In the United Provinces, America had many well-wishers, but among all the friendly elements in the Netherland population, Catholics were the most conspicuous. Why? Probably for the reason that two Catholic States were already arrayed against England. In the dismemberment of the British Empire, France found perfect satisfaction for her great exertions; Spain won back her two Floridas, and the United States achieved their independence. Alone among England's enemies in those world-wide wars the United Provinces suffered severely. Nevertheless, after Yorktown, that nation loaned to America the sum of \$1,304,000.

Of all these stirring scenes Frederick the Great was an interested spectator. He urged Holland, as he had, through diplomatic channels, urged France, to make war on England. This employment of his neighbors would permit him to execute unhindered his own schemes of conquest. It would not be fair, however, to assume that all his motives were interested ones. The King of Prussia rendered the United States a positive

service when he prevented German mercenaries from passing through his kingdom. Of the German volunteer officers, the German-American soldiers, and the Germans serving under the flag of France, we shall have something to say presently.

The neutrality of Prussia, the friendship of Holland and the considerable services of Spain and her colonies deserve the gratitude of the American people. To this friendly list might be added the name of Russia's Empress. What, then, shall be said of the generous loans of France, of the fine army of Rochambeau and of that dauntless fleet that shattered the hopes of England and wrote the doom of Cornwallis? In any account of Washington's allies, France deserves the place of prominence. Her attempts at Newport and Savannah, though they seemed merely to raise and then to disappoint the hopes of all America, really put the British on the defensive at a time when they had concluded to wage aggressive war. Almost from the beginning her financial assistance had much to do with the maintenance of the struggle. The story of Beaumarchais is one of the romances of history. In the overthrow of the British at Yorktown the army of Rochambeau took a very distinguished part, but the most timely and the most efficient service of France was the victory of her fine fleet off the capes of the Chesapeake and later its effective participation in the siege of Yorktown. Since the days when the might of the Armada menaced the very existence of England perhaps no more powerful armament had put to sea. Besides transports and smaller vessels the Count de Grasse, with 19,000 men, commanded twenty-six of the finest warships afloat. His defeat of the combined fleets of Admiral Hood and Admiral Graves left little hope for Britain. There was no later attempt at subjugation, and, soon after, his victorious fleet performed useful services at Yorktown.

Still earlier d'Estaing had inflicted no small injury upon English fleets at Newport and Grenada. It was the arrival of a French fleet that forced General Clinton to abandon Rhode Island. The gallant Destouches, too, against a superior force, won fame at the capes of the Chesapeake. Portions of the French navy were weakening England in remote quarters of

the globe. Those familiar with naval history will remember, about the same time, the brilliant work of Suffern in the Indian ocean. All this contributed to weaken the still formidable sea-power of Britain.

We have been considering the nations that assisted in winning the independence of the United States. Devotees of liberty came also to offer their swords. Of these the best known, and the one most endeared to Americans, was the Marquis de la Fayette. Other chivalrous French officers came here before the army and navy of their country. From gallant Poland, that had twice saved Europe from the hordes of Asia, came Pulaski and Kosciuszko. From Germany came de Kalb and Von Steuben. Except La Fayette perhaps the last-named rendered the most undoubted service to the cause of American liberty. Von Steuben's instructions in tactics made Washington's Continentals, man for man, more than a match for the best drilled troops of England.

In the United States there were few Catholics at the time of the Revolution, but on all its borders they were to be found in considerable numbers and everywhere they were either neutral or friendly. The preceding remarks have emphasized the fact that America had numerous and powerful friends in Catholic nations. The records show, however, that a few Catholics were found fighting under the banner of St. George. Indeed, if some of them were not found on that side, they would have formed a singular exception, for the list of loyalists shows that nearly all, if not indeed all the Christian churches were represented in the ranks of the Tories.

In our school days we all learned that Hessians, Waldeckers and Brunswickers were fighting the battles of England. We did not learn, however, that many German-Americans were found in the patriot army, and that the Royal Deux Ponts, the fine Alsatian regiment of Count Zweibrücken, was serving under the lilies of France. Some contemporary patriots have prepared a fine volume entitled *The French Soldiers in the American War (1778-1783)*." Of this regiment, 1,300 strong, the officers were:

*Colonel.*

Le comte de Forbach de Deux-Ponts.

*Colonel en Second.*

Le vicomte de Deux-Ponts.

*Lieutenants-Colonels.*

De Haden.

Le baron d'Esebeck.

*Major.*

De Pretz.

*Quartier-maitre trésorier.*

Anciaux.

*Capitaines Commandants.*

Le baron de Fürstenwaerther.

“ “ de Wisch.

“ “ De Klock.

“ “ De Flad.

“ “ De Thuillieres.

“ “ De Sunnahl.

“ “ De Stack.

“ “ Du Hainault.

“ “ Ruhle de Lilienstern.

“ “ Charles de Cabannes.

*Capitaines en Second.*

Max de Cabannes.

Le baron de Haacke.

De Fircks.

Le baron d'Esebeck.

De Mühlenfels.

De Ludwig.

Le baron de Johann.

Le chevalier de Haacke.

Le baron de Closen.

*Premiers Lieutenants.*

Le comte de Spaner.

Le baron de Kalb,  *fils du general de ce nom.*

Le baron de Schwengsfeld.

Le baron de Glaubitz.

Le baron de Truchsess.

Le baron de Bibra.

D'Ichtersheim.

*Lieutenants en Second.*

De Bertrand.

De Schauenbourg.

Du Puget.

Balthazar de Schauenbourg.

Le baron de Rathsamhausen.

Le Baron de Guntzer.

De Geispitzheim.

Le baron de Galatin.

*Sous-Lieutenants.*

De Pradelles.

De Schwerin.

De Bergh.

De Humbert.

De Gallois.

Schutz.

De Hoen.

De Galonnie de Varize.

Le baron de Luckner.

De Custine.

De Teshery.

De Ribeaupierre.

D'Egloffsheim.

De Zoller.

De Rupplin.

De Savignac.

De Martines.

De Tschudy.

De la Roche.

De Verget.

Leval.

For the services of this splendid organization American gratitude is due not to Frederick of Prussia or to any of the princes of Germany, but to King Louis, of whose army they were a part. After hearing the names of these officers it will surprise nobody to be told that Count Zweibrücken was the first to lead his men into the British entrenchments at Yorktown.

These remarks on Washington's allies may be appropriately concluded by enumerating the officers of two other regiments of King Louis:

*Colonel.*

Arthur Dillon.

*Colonel-en-Second.*

Theobald Dillon.

*Lieutenant-Colonel.*

Barthelemy Dillon.

*Major.*

James O'Moran.

*Quartermaster, etc.*

Barthelemy Mencarely.

*Capitaines.*

Moore, Richard.

Purdon, Simon.

Banckes, Thomas.

Nugent, Anselm.

Swigny, Paul.

Shee, Robert.

Moore, William.

O'Neill, Bernard.

O'Berin, Michael.

Taafe, Laurence.

Mandeville, James.

MacGuire, Philip.

MacDermott, Thomas, Sr.

O'Reilly, John.

Kelly, William.

MacDermott, Thomas, Jr.

Novolan, Christopher.

O'Dwyer, Denis.

Lynch, Isidore.

Coghlan, Terence.

*Lieutenants.*

Greenlaw, John B.

Dillon, Thomas.

O'Keeffe, Patrick.

O'Farel, Claude.

MacDermott, Bernard.

Walsh, Michael.

Evin, Nicholas.

Commerfort, Joseph.

Browne, John.

Duggan, John.

*Lieutenants en Second.*

Darcy, Louis.

Fitz Harris, William.

Brown, Thomas.

Taafe, Christopher.

Fennell, John.

Hussey, John.

Seyslip, Nicholas W.

Swigny, Edmund.

O'Farell, Emanuel.

O'Farrell, James.

*Sous-Lieutenants.*

MacCloskey, James.  
 Morgan, John B.  
 MacSheehy, Patrick.  
 Fitzgerald, Edward.  
 Shee, William.  
 O'Farel, Emanuel.  
 Fitzmaurice, Joseph.  
 O'Reilly, Charles.  
 MacDonald, John B.

Khnopff, Louis.  
 Mahony, Denis.  
 Sheldon, William.  
 O'Moran, Charles.  
 Owens, Henry.  
 Strange, Patrick.  
 Purdon, Henry.  
 Murphy, Patrick.  
 Hays, Thomas.  
 O'Meara, Daniel.

The *regiment de Walsh* contained the following officers:—

*Major.*

Thaddeus O'Brien.

*Quartermaster, etc.*

Charles Bancelin.

*Capitaines.*

Fitzmaurice, Thomas.  
 Walsh, Charles.  
 O'Neil, John.  
 Nagle, James.  
 O'Brien, John.  
 D'Arcy, James.

*Capitaines en Second.*

Stack, Edward.  
 Bellew, Lawrence.  
 O'Croly, Charles.  
 O'Driscoll, James.  
 O'Connor, Armand.

*Lieutenants.*

Plunkett, Francis.

O'Riordan, James.  
 Keating, William.  
 Barry, Richard.

*Lieutenants en Second.*

O'Shiel, James.  
 O'Meara, John B.  
 O'Gorman, Charles.  
 Meighan, George.  
 MacCarthy, Eugene.

*Sous-Lieutenants.*

Keating, John.  
 Cruice, James.  
 O'Crawley, Felix.  
 Darell, Philip.  
 O'Flynn, James.  
 Barker, William.  
 Traut, Thomas.  
 Barry, David.  
 O'Cahill, Louis.  
 Tobin, James.

The regiment first mentioned, that of Colonel Dillon, was not only in the final fight at Yorktown, but in the earlier attack on Savannah. Walsh's command furnished both officers and men for some of the raids of Paul Jones. When destruction was impending, Cornwallis selected the dashing Tarleton to cut

a way out for the army and attempt to march to New York. At Gloucester the Dillon regiment extinguished this hope. Escape being impossible, only surrender was left.

In the enumeration of America's friends nothing has been said of the Irish. This is because they were found in nearly all the Continental organizations: in many of them in considerable numbers. From the 12th of October, 1492, when Guillelmo Ires, of County Galway, came with Columbus, Irishmen had been coming to America, and, as they have ever since been doing, had been making themselves at home. In the general records they are not distinguished from natives. From names alone one cannot infer nationality. English names are as common in Dublin as in Kent and even yet there can be found in Ireland names that Hamlet must have heard at Elsinore.

Some officers prepared what are technically known as "descriptive lists." These records usually show the place of birth of each enlisted man; also his age, height, color of hair—and whether it was worn long or short. The statement made to Parliament that nearly half the rebel army was Irish is not so great an exaggeration as is sometimes believed. Of the gallant Irish army officers, General Montgomery was a fine type, and Barry was no less admirable a specimen of the enterprising and fearless Irish naval officer.

After giving full credit to the undoubted services of Washington's allies and friends, there were left for him exploits enough not only for glory but for immortality. Before foreign assistance was seriously expected, Washington had driven the British forever from Boston. Again, after grim-visaged war had frowned on him at Long Island, he astonished the military captains of the world by his brilliant strategy at Trenton and Princeton, when he not only defeated his victorious pursuer but actually put him for a season on the defensive. When Congress abdicated its leadership of the American people and made him a dictator, he wisely used for the public welfare that boundless authority. Later, when Congress blundered by its appointment of Gates to the command in the Carolinas, Washington retrieved that blunder by sending thither General Greene, who harassed the enemy and finally forced him into

Virginia. Nathaniel Greene had a share, and a very important share, in the victory at Yorktown. So likewise had those gallant pioneers from East Tennessee, who annihilated a part of the British Army at King's Mountain.

Long before foreign assistance reached America, Saratoga had been fought and won. Indeed, that event made foreign aid a possibility. At a time when the cause of liberty seemed hopelessly lost, Washington's character and genius alone sustained American patriotism and gave new resolution to the leaders in the struggle for independence. Rather than submit longer to British rule, he had resolved, in case of disaster, to turn his face toward the Alleghanies and settle in the wilderness beyond.

In slowly working out its grand processes, time selects and shapes its own instruments. Nowhere in its rich annals do we find better proof of its unerring methods. With or without foreign assistance the American Revolution must have failed but for the military genius of General Washington.

"Peace," says the great Puritan poet, "hath her victories no less renowned than war." Milton's memory must have summoned up a vision of things past. If his eye could have pierced the future, he would have seen still stronger proofs of his fine observation. The critical era of American history was the period between 1783 and 1789. Its problems we have not now the time to consider. For the present it must suffice to say that the Government had lost the confidence of the American people, and that abroad it was beginning to be regarded with contempt. The new experiment in freedom was perilously close to shipwreck. Once more General Washington averted disaster. The Alexandria commissioners who urged a call for a convention at Annapolis must have come to such a conclusion at his Mount Vernon mansion.

If one read the letters and the diaries of those troublous times, he perceives on the political landscape but a single great figure, that of Washington, who towered above all his contemporaries. From every quarter of the Union and from many parts of Europe he received appeals to exert his great influence to save the nation. Those appeals were not in vain. To the public welfare that great man was never indifferent.



A little later we find him in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia presiding over that remarkable body of men who guided this infant republic on its dim and perilous way. In that eventful summer of 1787 they constituted the American Federal State precisely as it exists to-day. As he always *had* been, he was once more a leader—this time in the bitter struggle for the adoption of the Constitution. His gifted lieutenants, Madison and Hamilton, were the actors who appeared to the public, but in their grand endeavor they were constantly encouraged and aided by the great patriot. The story of their perfect success is a familiar one.

When the Constitution was adopted, men turned again to Washington to assist them in putting it into operation. He responded to the general demand, and for almost eight years gave the country an example of administrative efficiency such as it has not looked upon again. As President, he proved at least as great as he had been as a soldier. Jealous though it was of its power, the new Congress, like the old one, practically left the entire matter of public finance, departmental organization and foreign relations in his skilful hands. That confidence was not misplaced, for Washington found a subordinate who anticipated all his plans, who possessed an energy as tireless as his own and who proved equal to all the tasks imposed by Congress. The fame of Alexander Hamilton in no way diminishes that of President Washington; indeed, it adds much to his stature to have brought into political life the greatest of America's constructive statesmen. In his exercise of the appointing power Washington stands far above nearly all his successors. In our time versatility seems to be more common: now, every cabinet officer is believed to be qualified to conduct any of the executive departments. The principle of rotation seems so completely to have superseded the principle of fitness that though we could name all the heads of departments for one hundred years of our history, perhaps few amongst us could follow the succession of cabinet changes in a recent administration. It is possible that fewer still could enumerate the achievements of recent cabinet members. Nobody asks what has any

of those gentlemen done; the inquiry might be embarrassing; it would certainly be uncomplimentary. However, with our immeasurable energy and our boundless resources, there are few blunders that for a while we may not continue to commit with impunity.

I have always found it difficult to understand why Emerson was puzzled by the greatness of Washington's fame and the smallness of his achievement. "We cannot find," says that philosopher "the smallest part of the personal weight of Washington in the narrative of his exploits." Either the narrative failed to enumerate all the public services of Washington or Emerson was not impressed, as he should have been, by the suggestive importance of certain fine incidents in the career of the first President. For our purpose this afternoon a single fact will suffice.

The President's nephew, Bushrod Washington, had intended to apply for the position of Federal Attorney for the State of Virginia, but before doing so, he consulted the President. Because of his character as well as his professional qualifications it was not unreasonable in him to expect the appointment. In the administration of President Adams he was appointed to the bench of the United States Supreme Court, but from his uncle he got no office. Instead of a commission he received this brief note:

"Dear Bushrod,

\* \* \* \* \*

"You cannot doubt my wishes to see you appointed to any office of honor or emolument in the new government, to the duties of which you are competent; but however deserving you may be of the one you have suggested, your standing at the bar would not justify my nomination of you as attorney to the Federal District Court in preference to some of the oldest and most esteemed general court lawyers in your own State, who are desirous of this appointment. My political conduct in nominations, even if I were uninfluenced by principle, must be exceedingly circumspect and proof against just criticism; for the eyes of Argus are upon me, and no slip will pass

unnoticed, that can be improved into a supposed partiality for friends or relations." <sup>1</sup>

Something too much of the Cato? Perhaps; but if his successors had had only a tincture of his Roman sternness, favorites could never have so far filled the public offices that it would have been necessary to increase the number of working hours of efficient employees—a compensating law of Executive wisdom that apportions the burden to the backs of the strong.

An examination of President Washington's administrations is a theme not for a single discourse but rather for a score of them. Even then, we should know him only as a statesman. Before he became the first of American statesmen he was universally recognized as the first of American patriots and still earlier he was known throughout the world as the first of American soldiers.

His grand career has attracted the student of political science as well as military science, the reformers of old commonwealths as well as the builders of new ones, and all of them, statesman and strategist, political moralist and political architect, find much to instruct, everything to admire.

"Prosperity," says Bacon, "doth best discover vice, but adversity doth best discover virtue." As President, Washington enjoyed political prosperity. He had seen his ideas embodied in enduring institutions and he beheld his country setting forth with confidence upon her career of glory, but he continued, as he had always been, tranquil, temperate and grand. As a soldier he had known the harsh countenance of adversity. In that portion of his career we find accumulated proofs of a patience in our experience unequalled, of a fortitude that defied even disaster and of a resourcefulness that accomplished miracles.

For our purpose it is not necessary to question the surviving witnesses of oriental monarchies. Those mute memorials of the antique world give only indistinct messages concerning prehistoric chieftains. In the leading states of later times we behold a long line of patriots and conquerors. From their num-

<sup>1</sup> Sparks, x, 23 and 24.

ber we may select for comparison the greatest and the best. From the wreck of the Hellenic world we can summon up Epaminondas and Alexander; in the buried greatness of Carthage we may behold the dire effects of Hannibal's revenge, and in the glorious chronicles of Rome re-read the deeds of Scipio and Cæsar. What have their deeds done for humanity? Coming down to times more modern we find many illustrious leaders. Our era has given to the world Charlemagne, Alfred, Brian, Wallace, St. Louis, Sobieski, Frederick and Napoleon. Some distinguished for their goodness, others remembered chiefly for their greatness. Their service, however, and in many cases their fame was *municipal*. The achievements of Washington are not bounded by meridians or by parallels, but on them, as on the ensign of Britain, the sun never sets. In America he was the grand architect of constitutional freedom. For more than one hundred and twenty years a prosperous and contented people has enjoyed its blessings and shared them generously with the down-trodden and the oppressed of every land. America herself is scarcely unanimous in her admiration of Jefferson or of Lincoln. Concerning Washington alone she has no doubt, and concerning him the world has no doubt. Even in his greatness he was unique. Of him it can be said that among the great men of the earth he was the best, and that among her good men he was the greatest.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

## THE DEPENDENCE OF ST. JEROME ON ORIGEN

---

One of the greatest, and perhaps the truest criticism passed upon St. Jerome's commentaries at large, is that they are nothing more, for the greater part, than compilations. He himself confesses that he has drawn his information from several sources. "I must add that in my preface to the First Book of that work (Ephesians), I gave fair notice that my remarks would be partly my own, partly those of other commentators, and that thus the commentary would be the work conjointly of the ancient writers and myself."<sup>1</sup>

Always a hasty writer, his works were bound to be, to a great extent, imperfect in form, poor in contents, wavering and contradictory, and often, especially in difficult passages, mere repetitions of the opinions of the exegetes who had preceded him. We know that he had no scruple in appropriating the work of another without even mentioning or alluding to the fact. So characteristic is this of his writings that Zahn has no hesitation in calling him the greatest literary thief of all the Latin writers that preceded him.<sup>2</sup>

But the point here is precisely this: Did he use Origen's treatises as such an authority? Unquestionably, yes, from the overwhelming mass of testimony which St. Jerome himself affords us. Prior to the year 398 A. D. he was an ardent though indiscriminate admirer of Origen. In a letter written to Paula he passed an unqualified eulogy upon the great Alexandrian. "But why, you ask me, have I thus mentioned Varro and the man of brass? Simply to bring to your notice our Christian man of brass, or, rather man of adamant—Origen, I mean, whose zeal for the study of Scripture has fairly earned for him this latter name. . . . Who has ever managed to read all that he has written? Yet what reward have his exertions brought

<sup>1</sup> Preface to the First Book of the Commentary on Jeremiah.

<sup>2</sup> *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Kanon*, II, 88.

him? He stands condemned by his bishop, Demetrius, only the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Phenicia, and Achaia dissenting. Imperial Rome consents to his condemnation, and even convenes a senate to censure him, not, as the rabid hounds who pursue him, cry, because of the novelty or heterodoxy of his doctrines, but because men could not tolerate the incomparable eloquence and knowledge which, when once he opened his lips, made others dumb." <sup>3</sup>

So much does he esteem the work of Origen, that in the same year, 394 A. D., he directs Pope Damasus to consult this author for the answers to two questions that the prelate proposed to him for solution. <sup>4</sup>

In his Preface to the Book on Hebrew Names, after having indicated his authorities, he refers to the great Alexandrian writer, in the following terms: "I wished also in this to intimate Origen, whom all but the ignorant acknowledge as the greatest teacher of the Church next to the Apostles; for in this work, which stands among the noblest monuments of his genius, he endeavored as a Christian to supply what Philo as a Jew, had omitted." <sup>5</sup>

In 392 A. D., we find him writing in his preface to Micheas, in complaint of the charge brought against him that he was merely making a compilation of what this learned man had written before him. He attempts a vindication, whilst maintaining his great regard for Origen. Speaking of his enemies, he writes: "What they consider a reproach, I regard as the highest praise, since I desire to imitate him who, I doubt not, is acceptable to all wise men." <sup>6</sup>

It is true that in after years he felt it necessary to condemn the great Alexandrian. "*Laudavi interpretem, non dogmatisten, ingenium, non fidem, philosophum, non apostolum; si mihi creditis, Origenistes nunquam fui; si non creditis, nunc esse cessavi.*" <sup>7</sup> Still the fact remains, and it is sufficient for our present inquiry, that from the years 384-392, at least, St. Jerome openly and unqualifiedly praised Origen and sought in no way to conceal the great esteem in which he held him.

<sup>3</sup> Letter 33.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Letter 36.

<sup>5</sup> P. L. XXIII, 772.

<sup>6</sup> P. L. XXV, 1189.

<sup>7</sup> Ep. 82, 2, 3.

The majority of his commentaries were certainly written before 398 A. D., and we can safely say that all that possibly could, bore traces of Origen's influence.

It would be a long and tedious task to discuss in turn each writing where this influence is manifest. No group of writings exhibit it more clearly than the saint's commentaries on the four Pauline Epistles, Galatians, Ephesians, Titus and Philemon. All biographers and students of St. Jerome are unanimous in assigning these commentaries to one and the same period of literary activity. All were the outcome of that desire to comment on all the epistles of the great Apostle, a desire which he never realized. In his prefaces to both Galatians and Ephesians, St. Jerome explicitly mentions that he used the works of Origen for their composition. In the former, he states that his commentary is a work unattempted by any writer of the Latin language. Victorinus, it is true, had published such a commentary, but he was "too busily engaged with secular history, and knew nothing of the Scriptures," to treat it "in a manner worthy of the dignity of the subject." He then mentions a string of Greek writers, among whom is Origen, who he asserts are the foundation upon which he is building his own work. It is true that in the commentary itself he mentions Origen only in regard to Gal. iii, 1, but it is clear that throughout the work he freely uses him, so much so that, as one writer has said, we could find, had we Origen's commentary, that he incorporated many passages bodily. How true this may be, we are not in a position to know. But this we know, judging this commentary by the one which follows it, that St. Jerome was not far from the truth, when he claims in the preface that it is more the work of others than his own. For "others" we may conveniently substitute the name of Origen and do no injustice to St. Jerome. In his preface to the commentary on Ephesians, he refers explicitly to his sources. "I remark in the prefaces for your information that Origen composed three volumes on this Epistle and I have partly followed him." How far he did borrow from Origen may be seen by any one who will take the trouble of comparing the fragmentary commentary

of the Alexandrian with that of St. Jerome. Rufinus took special pains to show that here St. Jerome slavishly copied Origen. This is manifestly unfair, for St. Jerome did not go over heart and soul to Origen, nor did he knowingly adopt his heretical views. He did, however, unconsciously lapse into some expressions which in their last analysis appear anything but orthodox.

We are met with the same phenomenon when we come to his commentary on Titus. There is no explicit testimony that St. Jerome used any authorities, for he makes mention of none. But we are sure of this one point, namely, that Origen's commentary on this same Epistle lay before him, from which he drew copiously. Unfortunately we do not possess the whole work of Origen. But the few fragments we do possess clearly point to this conclusion.

We have, then, good grounds for believing that in three of the four commentaries written at this time, St. Jerome depended in great measure on the work Origen had done before him. There is, therefore, at least an antecedent probability that he employed the same authority for Philemon. Grutzmacher is of the opinion that St. Jerome turned from the Pauline Epistles to the books of the Old Testament not so much from choice as from necessity. He was forced, if he were to continue his work, to depend on his own efforts entirely, as he had no authors to fall back on to blaze the way for him. In the Epistles he did comment upon he had Origen as guide, but here Origen's work ended. Here, too, ended St. Jerome's work, as far as the Epistles were concerned.<sup>8</sup>

It might be argued that as we have no explicit mention of Origen's name in the commentary of Philemon, there is no evidence that he made use of this author. But still there are marks of an internal character which points to him as at least one of the sources of information. The fact that he avoids all indulgence in the favorite interpretation of Origen, is of little import. Origen himself, from what we can glean from the fragments of his work, employed it but sparingly. Yet it

<sup>8</sup> Grutzmacher, *Hieronymus*, II, 49.



is untrue that he entirely escapes the allegorical interpretation. This is evidenced by his own comment in vv. 23 and 24, where he takes a mystical and hidden meaning of the word "captivity."<sup>9</sup> This same explanation of the idea of being captive is met with again in both his commentaries on Ephesians and Titus.<sup>10</sup> From these we gather that he was giving expression to an opinion which was distinctly and characteristically Origenistic. Origen believed and taught that the soul was imprisoned in the body, which when released by death would fly back to the place whence it came. Rufinus, in his famous controversy, boldly accuses him of quoting, without any censure whatsoever, statements which plainly inferred the pre-existence of souls and the final restoration of the devil to his former glory. In corroboration of his charge he takes up first the testimony of his commentary on Ephesians, then that of Titus and then adds the testimony of Philemon.<sup>11</sup>

From the foregoing remarks, it is evident that St. Jerome made use of Origen when he wrote his work on Philemon. Grutzmacher goes so far as to say that had we only the preface and no other proof, it could still be clearly shown that the work was not St. Jerome's own.

One passage taken from the work of Origen reads very much like what we find in St. Jerome's comment on v. 5 which reads: "Hearing of thy charity and faith, which thou hast in the Lord Jesus, and towards all the saints." Their close affinity is easily seen in the following comparison:

#### JEROME.

But what I say is this: One believes in God the Creator; he cannot believe in him unless he first believes all that is written about the saints is true: That Adam was created by God from the slime of the earth, that Eve was formed

#### ORIGEN.

But what we say is this: He who would believe in God and would accept his doctrine as true, believes also this, that Adam was the first man created; believes also concerning Eve, that God taking one of the ribs of Adam, formed her that she

<sup>9</sup> P. L. xxvi, 617.

<sup>10</sup> *In Eph.* iii, 1, P. L. xxvi, 477, 478; *In Tit.* vi, 20, P. L. xxvi, 553.

<sup>11</sup> *Contr. Hier.* i, 40, P. L. xxi, 579.

from his rib taken from his side, that Enoch was taken up into heaven, that Noe, being shipwrecked, was alone preserved of the earth's inhabitants, that the first patriarch Abraham, commanded to depart from his country and his kindred left the covenant of circumcision to posterity, which he received as a sign of future generations, that Isaac was offered as a victim, and a ram crowned with thorns being offered in his stead, prefigured the passion of the Lord; that Moses and Aaron afflicted Egypt with ten plagues; that the sun stood still in Gabaon and the moon in the valley of Ailon at the command and prayers of Josue the son of Nave. It is too tedious to go through all the deeds of the Judges, and the whole story of Samson to draw the mysterious meaning of the true sun (for this is what his name means). I come to the books of Kings, when in the time of harvest, at the prayers of Samuel, rain fell from heaven immediately and flowed in streams, and David was anointed king and Nathan and Gad prophesied mysteries; when Elias was taken up to heaven in a fiery chariot, and Eliseus endowed with a twofold spirit raised the dead. These and other things which are written concerning the saints; and unless one believes everything, he cannot truly believe in the God of the saints, nor can he have any faith in the Old Testament unless he approve everything that history tells of the patriarchs and the prophets and other famous men, so that he might arrive at a belief in the law, and the justice of God be revealed in him, bringing him from faith to trust, as

might be his wife; believes also that Enos truly hoped to call upon the name of the Lord God, and that Enoch, because he was pleasing to God for two hundred years, was taken away after he had begotten Mathusalem; also concerning Noe that because he accepted the command to build the ark, was alone saved from the deluge, together with those only who entered the ark with him. Likewise concerning Abraham that he merited the covenant of God, and that while under the oak of Mambre, he sought the entertainment of three men, one of whom was the Lord. He believes also of Isaac, how he was born, how he was offered as a sacrifice by his father and how he merited to hear the oracles of the Lord: but he believes too of Jacob that he was renamed by God when his name was changed to Israel: also of Moses, that he ministered to God by signs and wonders. He believes also that Josue, the son of Nave, being heard by God, made the sun stand still over Gabaon, and the moon over Helon. But what is to be said of the faithful Judges and of those things which through them their works are referred; or in the books of Kings, of Samuel who in the time of harvest asked for and received rain? And of David, whom the Lord took from his flocks in order to rule over his son Jacob and Israel, his inheritance? He believes also in Nathan that he prophesied and also in Gad: but of Solomon that the Lord appeared to him in a vision: and of Elias that he was taken up into heaven: believes all his works which are recorded, his signs and his miracles: but also of Eliseus, who not only made the dead

it is written: "The just man liveth by faith."<sup>12</sup>

son of the Sunamites to rise, but also caused a dead body, thrown on his bones to have life. Therefore, each one of the faithful ought to believe everything which is written about Ezechias, that in his days the shadow of the sun retreated. Therefore, our faith, first of all is in our Lord Jesus Christ, but because of Him, also in all the saints, patriarchs, prophets, or apostles of Christ, in that measure which we referred to above.<sup>13</sup>

Immediately the question arises: Did St. Jerome write this passage by chance? Or was he dependent upon Origen? That a negative answer should be given to the first question, and an affirmative to the second will appear after a close study of the literary relationship which exists between the two texts. Unfortunately for our study we have only this fragment on which to base our conclusion. As a first point, we know that the passage, as contained in the writings of Origen, is a part of the commentary on Philemon. This much St. Pamphilus tells us. Here our source of direct information ends. In all probability Origen's passage is a commentary on the same verse as in St. Jerome. Were we in the presence of a text which demanded such an interpretation there would be some underlying reason for both writers adopting the same mode of expression. But this is not the case. Any one reading the verse in question must be struck by the comment which both Origen and St. Jerome make upon it. This fact is significant, and arouses a suspicion at once that the accounts are not independent one of the other. As far as is known, no commentator, on his own initiative, has ventured this explanation, and if he has it was because he borrowed it from St. Jerome and did not arrive at it independently. Such agreement as exists between these two writers, on a text whose wording could not suggest such an exposition, seems so strange that no explanation, unless it be that of depend-

<sup>12</sup> *In Phil.* 5, P. L. xxvi, 609.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Pamphilus, *Apologia pro Origene*, P. G. xvii, 591-593.

once, will suffice. No one has ever interpreted the passage as Origen and therefore no one would offer his development. Besides it can be shown that St. Jerome's idea in this particular passage is not personal. He did not arrive at it by his own personal efforts as is evidenced by his commentary on Ephesians. In this Epistle we have a text which is strikingly similar to the fourth verse and following, of Philemon. The passage is, "Wherefore I also, hearing of your faith that is in the Lord Jesus and of your love towards the saints."<sup>14</sup>

It is, as it stands, as suggestive of the idea of the impossibility of faith in God without faith in His saints, as the text in Philemon. If, in St. Jerome's mind, the text of the latter Epistle has such a meaning, then the text of Ephesians should have the same. But this is not actually the case. He gives no hint of such an explanation; in fact, does not even refer to it. Were it not in his works one would doubt, and would have good reasons for doubting, that one and the same mind interpreted both passages. It may be true that he forgot the interpretation which he formerly gave, and it may be equally true that he changed his opinions. All this *may* be true, but it is not borne out by the facts of the case. If he had one gift, it was a tenacious memory, the proof of which lies in his wonderful knowledge of the Bible. Besides, the commentary on Ephesians was composed in the following year, so that there was no time for forgetfulness, nor for radical change in opinion. There must be a reason for his unsatisfactory explanation of Eph. i, 15, unsatisfactory in this sense, that it was not interpreted, as it should have been, in the light of Phil. 5. It might be asked, however, did Origen interpret the verse of Ephesians as he did Philemon? This question, of course, cannot be definitely answered, for we have not Origen's work. But even if both failed to comment on Ephesians as on Philemon, it only gives us another evidence of the former's dependence on the latter. To admit that both were led by chance to a similarity of treatment, not in one but in two distinct, yet almost identical passages, is demanding too much of human credence. This

<sup>14</sup> Eph. i, 15.

becomes the more emphatic when we view that both, in the development of their fundamental idea, call attention to two points which are identical. Both strongly insist that, first of all, the faith in the saints spoken of, is that very faith by which we believe that the saints are in reality true saints; and secondly, that the faith demanded of the faithful is a faith which believes everything written about the saints. These two ideas are illustrated by a brief sketch of Old Testament history. For both, the sources were the same, and in this regard, it would not seem so unnatural that both should hit upon the same examples here and there. Difference of subject matter always entails difference in terminology, and *vice versa* identity of theme often results in identity of language. No critic will deny this. But the identity of choice here is too great, and it must point to literary dependence. One need but take the little phrase, "quod autem dico tale est" and compare it with Origen's "quod autem dicimus tale est" to see how closely St. Jerome followed the Alexandrian. For not only is its language almost identical, for the only change is the substitution of a singular verb for a plural, but its very position is similar in both authors. It occurs as a hyphenated clause between the explanation of St. Paul's text and the illustration of the text. Besides, it occurs between two phrases which, although not absolutely the same as regards the general contents, are strikingly similar. Thus:

## JEROME.

Non est in Deum perfecta dilectio et fides quæ in ministros ejus odio et infidelitate tenuatur. *Quod autem dico tale est.* Credit quisquam in conditorem Deum, etc.

## ORIGEN.

Non enim potest esse perfecta in Deum fides, nisi quis habeat et hanc fidem, qua de sanctis quod sancti sunt creditur. Quod autem dicimus tale est: Qui crediderint in Deum, etc.

How unlikely it appears that both should employ a phrase not only similar in language but which serves the same purpose in both, and occupies a position between two phrases which in both are identical in thought and almost so in regard to language, without any dependence one upon the other. St. Jerome

*must* have known of Origen's commentary when he wrote. Nay, more; he must have had this commentary before him when he composed his work.

In justice to the saint, however, it must not be thought that he ever wilfully followed the great Alexandrian scholar in any of his opinions which involved the denial of any of the Church's dogmas. Although he confidently wrote on the passage Dt. **xxi**, 12, 13, "If we take all these things according to the letter are they not ridiculous?"<sup>15</sup> he nevertheless gave credence to many of the seemingly unlikely stories of the Bible and denied the same credence to others. He unhesitatingly subscribed to one of the most wonderful narratives of the Old Testament, namely, the incident of Jonas and the whale. He vehemently defends its historical character, maintaining that those who regarded it as unfounded in fact, believe stories more incredible than this.<sup>16</sup> Again, when commenting on the narrative of Nabuchodonosor's madness, he has no hesitancy in accepting it in its historical sense. It cannot for a moment be doubted that the saint felt the strangeness of both events. But in his acceptance of both he was swayed by dogmatic reasons. When the holy doctor accepted the Jonas narrative, its citation by the Lord as a prediction of His Resurrection influenced him in retaining its historical character. To reject it meant for him a flat denial of the dogma of the Resurrection. This he could not afford to do, and would not do, for whatever may have been his faults he never knowingly gave himself over to any heretical doctrine. As regards the second story, we are met by the same reason and the same motive. Dogma was at stake and had to be defended at all costs. This becomes clear from another passage in St. Jerome's commentary on Jonas. Whilst giving an explanation of Jon. **iii**, 6, 9, he writes. "I know that many interpret the king of Ninive (who at last heard the prophet's preaching, and descended from the throne, and clothed in sack-cloth, and sat in ashes: not content with his own conversation, he proclaims penance also the other princes, saying:

<sup>15</sup> Ep. 21.

<sup>16</sup> In *Jonam* **ii**, 2, P. L. **xxv**, 1131-1132.

Let men and beasts and oxen and sheep be tormented with hunger, let them be covered with sackcloth, and that turning away from their former evils they apply themselves wholly to repentance) as representing the devil, who in the end of the world (because no rational creature made by God will perish) laying aside his pride, will do penance and will be restored to his former state. To confirm this opinion they bring forward that example from the Book of Daniel where Nabuchodonosor, doing penance for seven years, was restored to his kingdom again. But this interpretation we reject because Sacred Scripture does not say this, and because all fear of God would be lost, while men would indulge in every vice thinking that even the devil, who is the author of evil, can be saved. And we know that in the Gospel, sinners are cast into eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels, and that of those it is said: Their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched." <sup>17</sup>

To whom does he refer when he says, "many interpret the king of Ninive as representing the devil who in the end of the world . . . will be restored to his former state?" We know only of one man who advocated such a view, and that was Origen. St. Jerome could not force himself to accept this interpretation without endangering his own faith, and the faith of the people at large, and consequently abandoned the allegorical interpretation and fell back on its literal meaning. By the "many" he has in mind one man, for as students of his writings know, he very often adopts this plural form when he has in mind to give one man's opinion. When this commentary was written, St. Jerome was undergoing a change in his attitude in regard to Origen. He was beginning to lose that incautious but great admiration for the learned scholar, and although he does not mention him by name, it is the first time that he declares against his views. He realized full well the strangeness of the story, but he realized fully as well that the only spiritual interpretation open to him and current at that time, meant a denial of the eternity of hell. His orthodoxy

<sup>17</sup> *Is.* LXVI, 24, P. L. XXV, 1142.

could never brook such a denial. The only alternative, as he saw it, was to accept the story as it was, and attempt some sort of an explanation.

In how far we of to-day are to judge St. Jerome must be clear. His methods may not have been our methods, but we cannot find it in our heart to condemn him even though his commentaries are largely compilatory and in most places where personal, often contradictory. To him all Scripture scholars owe an incalculable debt of gratitude, and if he had achieved nothing else than the preservation of many precious exegetical fragments from the pen of Origen, Apollinarius, Didymus and others, his work would still be regarded as priceless.

J. L. WEIDENHAN, S. T. L.

CARROLLTON MANOR, MD.



## NEWMAN'S SERMONS AND THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC REVIVAL

---

The main reason for this article is the settled conviction that the chroniclers of the Tractarian movement have generally overlooked, or at least greatly underrated, the very important part which Newman's Sermons played in the rise and spread of that momentous Catholic revival which shook the Anglican Establishment to its very foundation, brought back so many cultured Englishmen to the Church of their fathers, and changed the mental attitude of the whole English-speaking world towards the Church Catholic.

As a rule these chroniclers insist chiefly on the public historical events connected with the movement; laying sufficient, perhaps undue, stress on the effect of the Tracts for the Times, (particularly Tract 90) the Hampden incident, the Jerusalem bishopric, etc., but generally failing to attach due weight and importance to the quiet, but forceful, factor that had been at work for years previous to the dénouement, preparing men's minds and hearts for the change that was to come. There is every good and valid reason for believing that it was the sermons delivered by Newman at the University and St. Mary's, Oxford, that sowed the good seed which gradually blossomed into Tractarianism, and finally had its full fruition in the whole-hearted acceptance of Catholic faith and obedience.

Unless we realize the effect produced by these sermons, it is difficult to account for the impression made on Newman's disciples by such incidents as the Hampden affair, the Jerusalem bishopric, or even by the general anti-Catholic policy of the Establishment. Such, and similar methods were not at all new to Anglicanism; they had been in use for several centuries without protest. What was wrong now with what had previously been right? Only this: that many of England's foremost religious thinkers had taken a new view-point. Whereas they formerly gloried in the title of Protestant, they now

claimed to be Catholics; and, as such, they protested against the un-Catholic, or anti-Catholic, proceedings of the Established Church. And what was it that changed their point of view? A careful study of Newman's sermons, and of their deep and widespread influence on the religious thought of that day convinces us that they had more to do with it than may appear at first glance; much more than any other single cause; very much more than any one of the historical incidents above-mentioned: for, after all, the furore, the antagonism and disgust called forth by these historical incidents, sprang precisely from the Catholic principles already deeply implanted in the Tractarians—and implanted, most probably, by the sermons of Newman. In the March, 1913, issue of *The Bulletin*, the present writer recalled Newman's own words to show that it was not logic or history, but rather the devotional side of the Church, that ultimately effected the great Tractarian leader's conversion. So may we reasonably believe that, while logic and history played their part in the Romeward-trend, or home-coming, of his followers, the foundation, or starting-point, for the great mass of Anglican converts was the Catholic feeling or sentiment, engendered in them by the preaching of their leader.

In his preface to the eight volumes of "Parochial and Plain Sermons," Father Copeland says: "They made, in their day, partly through their publication, but yet more, probably, through their living effect upon those who heard them, a deep and lasting impression for good on the Communion for whose especial benefit they were designed; they exercised an extensive influence very far beyond it." No doubt, the printed word gives but a very faint notion of the impression the spoken word made on his audience as it came from the lips of this magnetic personality, of this man whose earnestness, devoutness, purity of life, sincerity, unselfishness, and religious simplicity, joined to the highest powers of intellect, had won the admiration and the love of all who ever came under his influence.

The following extracts from Principal Shairp's tribute to the wondrous qualities and effects of Newman's preaching are somewhat lengthy: but they are well worth the space they fill. "The centre from which his power went forth," writes Dr. Shairp,

"was the pulpit of St. Mary's, with those wonderful afternoon sermons. Sunday after Sunday, month by month, year by year, they went on, each continuing and deepening the impression the last had made. . . . When he began to preach, a stranger was not likely to be much struck, especially if he had been accustomed to pulpit oratory of the Boanerges sort. Here was no vehemence, no declamation, no show of elaborated argument, so that one who came prepared to hear a 'great intellectual effort' was almost sure to go away disappointed. Indeed, I believe that if he had preached one of his St. Mary's sermons before a Scotch town congregation, they would have thought the preacher a 'silly body.' The delivery had a peculiarity which it took a new hearer some time to get over. Each separate sentence, or at least each short paragraph, was spoken rapidly, but with great clearness of intonation; and then at its close there was a pause lasting for nearly half a minute, etc. It took some time to get over this, but that once done, the wonderful charm began to dawn on you. The look and bearing of the preacher were as of one who dwelt apart; who, though he knew his age well, did not live in it. From the seclusion of study, and abstinence, and prayer, from habitual dwelling in the unseen, he seemed to come forth that one day in the week to speak to others of the things he had seen and known. . . . The local, the temporary and the modern were ennobled by the presence of the Catholic truth belonging to all ages that pervaded the whole. His power showed itself chiefly in the new and unlooked-for way in which he touched into life old truths, moral or spiritual, which all Christians acknowledge, but most have ceased to feel. . . . As he spoke, how the old truth became new! How it came home with a meaning never felt before! He laid his finger—how gently, yet how powerfully!—on some inner place in the hearer's heart, and told him things about himself he had never known till then. Subtlest truths, which it would have taken philosophers pages of circumlocution and big words to state, were dropt out by the way in a sentence or two of the most transparent Saxon. What delicacy of style, yet what calm power! how gentle, yet how strong! how simple, yet how suggestive! how homely, yet how refined! To call these

sermons eloquent would be no word for them; high poems they rather were, as of an inspired singer, or the outpourings as of a prophet, rapt, yet self-possessed. And the tone of voice in which they were spoken, once you grew accustomed to it, sounded like a fine strain of unearthly music. Through the silence of that high Gothic building the words fell on the ear like the measured drippings of water in some vast dim cave. After hearing these sermons, you might come away still not believing the tenets peculiar to the high church system; but you would be harder than most men if you did not feel more than ever ashamed of coarseness, selfishness, worldliness, if you did not feel the things of faith brought closer to the soul." (Ap. Ward's *Life of Newman*, Vol. 1, pp. 64, 65.)

And even Kingsley, in the very midst of his bitter tirade against Newman, bears witness to the wonderful charm and power of his preaching: "as he swept magnificently past on the stream of his calm eloquence, seemingly unconscious of all presences, save those unseen, he delivered, unheeded, as with the finger-tip, to the very heart of an initiated hearer, never to be withdrawn again. I do not blame him for that. It is one of the highest triumphs of oratoric power."

It is clear enough from this that the written sermon gives but a very faint idea of the potency of Newman's spoken word. Nevertheless, the good effect of his preaching was by no means confined to the narrow circle of St. Mary's, or of Oxford. By reason both of the man and the matter, the printed word found its way to the eye, and the mind, and the heart of religious thinkers, even in the remotest corners of Britain. Nor was it merely a temporary or passing effect. It still lives; and England, and the religious world generally, are still feeling it. As Father Copeland remarks: "Many things, indeed, contained in these volumes have become, from the very readiness of their first acceptance, and from their gradual reception into the current of religious thought, so familiar that it requires some retrospect of the time previous to their appearance to appreciate the original freshness with which they brought out the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith— . . . and to understand the degree in which they have acted, like leaven, on the mind and

language and literature of the Church in this country, and have marked an era in her history." Even apart from Newman's personal fascination and vigor as a preacher, there is enough, and more than enough, in the subject-matter of the published sermons, to beget in the reader a fond admiration for Catholic principles and practices. To Newman's compatriots his style of preaching was a revelation; not the old, cold, dry-as-dust formalism of the typical Anglican parson—the empty, vapid, non-committal monologues usually rattled off in a routine, matter-of-fact way, to fulfil a weekly duty—but actual and practical sermons, instinct with religious life and fervor. They were the words of a man of intense convictions, who felt deeply the truth of what he said, and who had evidently first practised what he afterwards preached. There was, in fact, as much difference between the usual humdrum discourses of that day, and Newman's sermons, as there is between the dry bones of the skeleton, and the healthy flesh and blood of the normal living man.<sup>1</sup>

"They met, at that time," writes Father Copeland, "very real and great moral, intellectual, and spiritual needs of man—in giving depth and precision and largeness to his belief and apprehension of the mysteries of God, and seriousness and accuracy to his study and knowledge of himself. . . . They found a response in the hearts and minds and consciences of those to whom they were addressed, in marvelous proportion to the affectionate and stirring earnestness with which their author appealed to the conscious or dormant sense of their needs," etc. And all the competent judges who ever listened to him confirm this testimony, even his most determined adversaries. And they are generally agreed too, in fixing upon the main source of his extraordinary power. We have given Dr. Shairp's explanation. Wilfrid Ward (*Life of Newman*, Vol. I, p. 15) attributes it to "his extraordinary power of psychological analysis, his in-

<sup>1</sup> We have the word of Newman himself anent the dulness and deadness and unpracticalness of the average Anglican discourse. In the *Idea of a University* (p. 140), he writes: "The sermons of the English divines of the 17th century, how often are they mere repertories of miscellaneous and officious learning!"

aight into the workings of the human mind in individuals and in bodies of men." And Charles Kingsley writes: "the preacher who had the reputation of being the most acute man of his generation, and of having a specially intimate acquaintance with the weakness of the human heart."

The chief aim of Newman's discourses was to bring about a "reaction from the dry and superficial character of the religious teaching and the literature of the last generation or century," (the 18th) and to supply "the need that was felt both by the hearts and the intellects of the nation for a deeper philosophy." The needs of the intellect he cared for principally in the University sermons; the needs of the heart, chiefly in the parochial and plain discourses. "The philosophy of faith," writes Ward, (*Life*, Vol. 1, p. 58) "formed the subject of the remarkable sermons preached before the University, and afterwards published in 1843 as a volume. He (Newman) characterizes this volume, in writing to James Hope, as 'the best, not the most perfect, book I have done. I mean there is more to develop in it, though it is imperfect.' . . . The University sermons . . . were 'caviare to the general,' for the questioning attitude on religious belief was not widespread as yet among their readers. But by the more speculative minds in Oxford, as W. G. Ward, and the students of Coleridge, they were regarded, as by Newman himself, as containing his best and most valuable thoughts."

Touching the parochial and plain sermons, which appealed more to the needs of the heart, Ward writes: (*ibidem*) "The parochial sermons at St. Mary's, however, were the main instrument of Newman's influence on the Oxford of those years. They appealed to a far wider class than the University sermons, and the indelible impression they made on many minds has been recorded by eminent men of widely different schools of thought—by J. A. Froude and A. P. Stanley, by Mr. Gladstone and Sir Francis Doyle, by Principal Shairp and Lord Coleridge, as well as by such disciples of the movement as Henry Wilberforce and Dean Church. . . . 'They belong,' writes Dean Stanley, 'not to provincial dogma, but to the literature of all time.'"

As their title indicates, the sermons delivered at St. Mary's were intended to be plain and simple, easily intelligible to the average hearer. There were few, if any, attempts at high flights of rhetoric or oratory. So plain and simple, in fact, that the spies who were always at his heels, dogging his footsteps, as the Pharisees hounded the Master, regarded his sermons as artifices, as words intended, not to express, but rather to conceal, his real thought; as a sort of secret cipher code to be understood only by the initiated; and they were constantly on the alert to seek out hidden meanings in his words. Witness the charges of Kingsley, anent which Newman writes, half humorously, half pathetically: "This writer says 'I know that men used to suspect Newman—I have been inclined to do so myself—of writing a whole sermon, not for the sake of the text or of the matter, but for the sake of one simple passing hint—one phrase, one epithet.' Now observe, can there be a plainer testimony borne to the practical character of my sermons at St. Mary's than this gratuitous insinuation? . . . The same report was spread about me twenty years ago as this writer spreads now, and the world believed that my sermons at St. Mary's were full of red-hot Tractarianism. Then strangers came to hear me preach and were astonished at their own disappointment. I recollect the wife of a great prelate coming from a distance to hear me, and then expressing her surprise to find that I preached nothing but a plain, humdrum sermon. I recollect how, when . . . a number of strangers came to hear me, and I preached in my usual way, residents in Oxford, in high position, were loud in their satisfaction that on a great occasion, I had made a simple failure, for, after all, there was nothing in the sermon to hear. Well, but they were not going to let me off, for all my common-sense view of duty. Accordingly, they got up the charitable theory which this writer revives. They said that there was a double purpose in those plain addresses of mine, and that my sermons were never so artful as when they seemed commonplace; that there were sentences which redeemed their apparent simplicity and quietness. So they watched, during the delivery of a sermon, which to them was too practical to be useful, for the concealed point of it, which they could at least imagine,

if they could not discover." Remember, too, Kingsley's plain hint in the first passage I quoted from him: "delivered, unheeded, as with the finger-tip, to the very heart of an *initiated* hearer, never to be withdrawn again."

If one knew nothing of the effect of Newman's sermons beyond what he could gather from Newman's own rating of them, one would, in all likelihood, be inclined to consider them failures. The eminent preacher mentions frankly enough the comparatively few persons who were disappointed with him, but he says naught of the overwhelming majority that hung on his words as the words of an inspired prophet. At one time, after his retirement to Littlemore, he wrote rather despondingly to Keble anent his influence for good in the parish of St. Mary's. But the reader should remember Newman's perplexity of mind at that time. Keble, who knew better, tried to reassure him, and Keble's opinion in this matter was of far more worth than Newman's. Besides, we have only to recall the glowing tributes given in the course of this paper, from friends and foes, to realize that Newman greatly under-rated his own influence. And surely there is nothing surprising in this self-depreciation on the part of the man who was not aware, till years afterwards, that he was the real leader of the Tractarian movement, and that its disciples revered him to the extent of copying even his little peculiarities and mannerisms. True, he tells us that his audience at St. Mary's was mainly composed of University students, and that comparatively few of the parishioners attended, at least after he became suspected of Romanizing tendencies; but these University students were the brains of the nation, the future moulders of public opinion in Church and State, and consequently the best fitted to carry on the work so near and dear to his heart. This was the chief consideration urged upon him by his friends to induce him to hold on. "People tell me," he writes in the *Apologia* (p. 134), "on the other hand, that I am, whether by sermons or otherwise, exerting at St. Mary's a beneficial influence on our prospective clergy; but what if I take to myself the credit of seeing further than they, and of having, in the course of the last year, dis-



covered that what they approve so much is very likely to end in Romanism?"

And that is just precisely what it *was* bound to end in, for it had a very considerable leaven of "Romanism" in it from the start. Though the sermons "have been printed entire and unaltered, except in the most insignificant particulars," there is very little in them to which the orthodox Catholic can take exception. Father Copeland observes that "they cannot be free from passages which he (Newman) certainly knew would wish were otherwise, or would, one may be sure, desire to see altered or omitted." It is not at all surprising that there should be some few doctrinal errors in the sermons of a Protestant preacher. The surprising feature of the thing is that, in Newman's case, there are not a great many more. Aye, it is in truth almost incredible that the nine volumes of sermons which he delivered as an Anglican, should contain so very, very few anti-Catholic, or un-Catholic, passages, and that the discourses should be so almost invariably Catholic in tone. They are, in the main, the manifest outpourings of a mind and heart thoroughly imbued and saturated with the ascetic theology of the Church Catholic, such thoughts and expressions as might, not unaptly, have been penned by the authors of the "Imitation of Christ" and "Christian Perfection."

It must be admitted that, as regards a few distinctively Catholic doctrines, there are occasional unorthodox phrases; but even these are a distinct advance on the then prevalent Protestant views. To give a few instances: he never believed in Transubstantiation till he was received into the Church; yet he believed most firmly in a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and, on the occasion of Tract 90, claimed "the right of holding, with Andrewes, . . . the Mass, all *but* Transubstantiation, and with Hooker, that Transubstantiation itself is not a point for churches to part communion upon."

In his sermon on "The Eucharistic Presence," (Sermon XI, Vol. VI) he says: "The text speaks of the greatest and highest of all the Sacramental mysteries which faith has been vouchsafed, that of Holy Communion. . . . We call His Presence in this Holy Sacrament a spiritual presence, not as if 'spiritual'

were but a name or mode of speech, and He were really absent, but by way of expressing that He Who is present there can neither be seen nor heard; that He cannot be approached or ascertained by any of the senses; that He is not present in place . . . though He is really present. . . . All that we know, or need know, is that He is given to us, and that in the sacrament of Holy Communion." And, in Sermon XI, Vol. VII ("Attendance on Holy Communion"), "The true reason why people will not come to the Holy Communion is this—that they do not wish to lead religious lives. . . . I need not remind you, my brethren, that there is a peril attached to the unworthy reception. . . . If they did truly and religiously fear the blessed sacrament, so far, they would not be in danger of an unworthy reception. . . . When a Christian first comes to Holy Communion, he comes with awe and anxiety. At least I will not suppose the case of a person so little in earnest about his soul, and so profane, as to despise the ordinance when he first attends it," etc. Not at all bad for a Protestant preacher; and not such a very poor preparation for belief in the real Sacrament of the Eucharist when he came to recognize it. And it may be noted in passing, that he had this belief in a real presence, as well as a devotion to the Mother of God, as far back as the beginning of the thirties. He informs us, himself, in the "*Apologia*," (p. 25) that "He (Hurrell Froude) fixed deep in me the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence."

Yet, notwithstanding his devotion to the Blessed Virgin, it may seem very strange indeed, at first blush, that the attitude of the Catholic Church towards Mary should have proved, for a long time, probably his greatest crux—a veritable stumbling-block, a scandal and a rock of offence. It was precisely the practice of the Church (as he understood it) anent devotion to the saints generally, and to the Mother of God in particular, that delayed, more than any other single consideration, his entrance into the true fold.<sup>2</sup> Not that he objected to these devotions in themselves, but because he thought that the Church carried

<sup>2</sup> "I could not go to Rome, while I thought what I did of the devotions she sanctioned to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints." (*Apologia*, p. 184.)

them to excess. His ideas and perplexities on this matter will be best understood by a few quotations from his own writings. In his sermon on "The Communion of Saints," (Sermon XI, Vol. iv) he says: "the Communion of Saints is an article of the Creed, and therefore, is not a matter of secondary importance, of doubt or speculation. . . . When we praise God in Holy Communion, we praise Him with the angels and archangels, who are the guards, and with the saints, who are the citizens, of the City of God. . . . When we profess the creed, it is in no self-willed, arbitrary sense, but in the presence of those innumerable saints who well remember what its words mean, and are witnesses of it before God . . . When we pray in private, we are not solitary; others are 'gathered together' with us 'in Christ's Name,' though we see them not, with Christ in the midst of them. . . . When we approach the bishops who are the centers of that ministry, what have we before us but the twelve apostles, present but invisible? . . . The unseen world, through God's secret power and mercy, encroaches upon this world; and the Church that is seen is just that portion of it by which it encroaches," and more to the same effect. But he tempers and qualifies it all with a considerable leaven of Protestant misunderstanding: "Lastly, while we thus think of the invisible Church, we are restrained by many reasons from such invocations of her separate members as are unhappily so common in other Christian countries. First, because the practice was not primitive, but an addition when the world had poured into the Church; next, because we are told to pray to God only, and invocation may easily be corrupted into prayer, and then becomes idolatrous."

The truth is: Newman really held, for years before his reception into the Church, sound Catholic views on devotion to Mary and the saints, without his being aware of the fact. And his not being aware of it was entirely due to a misconception of the teaching and practice of the Church on these points. That is plain enough to us to-day; and it was plain enough to Newman himself after his conversion. When he saw the Church from the inside, he realized that its doctrine of the Communion of Saints had been his own identical creed all along, though he

did not know it. "In spite of my ingrained fears of Rome," he writes in the *Apologia* (p. 165) "and the decision of my reason and conscience against her usages, in spite of my affection for Oxford and Oriel, yet I had a secret longing love of Rome, the Mother of English Christianity, and I had a true devotion to the Blessed Virgin, in whose college I lived, and whose Immaculate Purity I had, in one of my earliest printed sermons, made much of."

With the exceptions I have noted, and the four sermons delivered in 1841, to defend the Anglican system, and possibly a few others, the number of serious doctrinal errors in Newman's discourses is almost infinitesimal. That the sermons were generally Catholic in tone and spirit, was a fact easily recognized by his adversaries all along the line; and though Newman himself protested against this interpretation at the time, and protested in all honesty and sincerity, he saw later that his opponents were in the right;<sup>3</sup> that he had, however unwittingly and unwillingly, given very good grounds for their indictment.<sup>4</sup> In his reply to Kingsley (Preface to the *Apologia*, p. xvii) he writes: "It is not my present accuser alone who entertains, and has entertained, so dishonorable an opinion of me and of my writings. It is the impression of large classes of men; the impression of twenty years ago and the impression now. There has been a general feeling that I was for years where I had no right to be; that I was a 'Romanist' in Protestant livery and service; that I was doing the work of a hostile Church in the bosom of the English Establishment, and knew it, or ought to have known it. There was no need of arguing

<sup>3</sup> By saying, "his opponents were in the right," and had "very good grounds for their indictment," is meant, of course, so far as the *Catholicity* of the sermons is concerned. As regards the charges of insincerity, dishonesty, duplicity, under-handedness, treachery, trying to undermine the Establishment, and covert labors in the interest of Rome, needless to remark, Newman's traducers had not the faintest shadow of right, or a leg to stand on. It was not the charge of Catholicity that pained Newman, and to which he took exception, but the impeachment of his honesty and good faith. As previously stated, and as will further appear from the sequel, he himself frankly confessed that Catholic tendency in his writings.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

about particular passages in my writings, when the fact was so patent, as men thought it to be. First, it was certain, and I could not deny it, that I scouted the name 'Protestant.' It was certain again, that many of the doctrines which I professed were popularly and generally known as the badges of the Roman Church as distinguished from the faith of the Reformation."

Writing to Keble, in 1840, Newman says: "I cannot disguise from myself that my preaching is not calculated to defend that system of religion which has been received for 300 years, and of which the Heads of the Houses are the legitimate maintainers in this place. They exclude me, as far as may be, from the University pulpit; . . . and they do so rightly, so far as this, that they understand that my sermons are calculated to undermine things established. I cannot disguise from myself that they are. No one will deny that most of my sermons are on moral subjects, not doctrinal; still I am leading my hearers to the Primitive Church, if you will, but not to the Church of England. . . . But this is not all. I fear I must allow it, whether I will or no, I am disposing them towards Rome. First, because Rome is the only representative of the Primitive Church besides ourselves; in proportion, then, as they are loosened from the one, they will go to the other. Next, because many doctrines which I have held have far greater, or their only scope, in the Roman system."

In his Preface to the third edition of the Oxford University Sermons, Newman writes: "Such faults were only to be expected in discussions of so difficult a character (and such faults were rare, as the reader may judge from what follows of Newman's own testimony) as some of them pursue, . . . written with no aid from Anglican, and no knowledge of Catholic theologians. He is only surprised himself that, under such circumstances, the errors are not of a more serious character. This remark applies especially to the Discourses upon the relation of Faith to Reason, which are of the nature of an exploring expedition into an all but unknown country. . . . As they proceed, however, they become more precise, as well as more accurate, in their doctrine."

To appreciate these sermons properly, one must put oneself,

as much as possible, in the historical setting of the time of their writing, and in the Protestant atmosphere which surrounded this unusual preacher at the time of their delivery. Unless we do that, we cannot possibly get a fair idea of what they meant to the England of that day, of the startling effect which they produced too, far beyond the bounds and confines of the British Isles. We must needs be favorably and deeply impressed by the matter and style of these sermons—by their genuine religious fervor, their intimate knowledge of God's ways and man's ways, their keen insight into the workings of the human heart, etc.—under any circumstances. Yet, had they been the work of *Father Newman*, the Catholic priest, writing for Catholics, under the guidance of the infallible Church, with fixed and sure principles of faith and morals, we should not be greatly surprised; it would be quite the natural and expected thing. But that such gems of genuine Catholic thought and feeling should be the creations of Newman the Anglican, before the light of the true faith had dawned on him—while he was still groping about in the dark—that is the marvel, the wonder of it all.

To understand the greatness of the works of a Shakespeare, a Chaucer, or any of the other great creators of a national literature, one must remember the literary, or un-literary, conditions of their time, the difficulties they had to contend with, the disadvantages under which they labored. It will never, never do to measure them by the standards of the present. We must not forget that these geniuses were the pioneers, the path-finders, the men who blazed the trail for those who came after them. There are plenty of third-rate writers today who could improve upon the works of genius, so far as artificial polish or finish is concerned; plenty who can write more fluently or gracefully, who have a more copious vocabulary and a better acquaintance with the rules of grammar. But we are well aware that these moderns are, after all, only more or less clever imitators, filching the gems of the great original, creative minds; and no sane judge would think, for an instant, of ranking them with the masters and makers of the language any more than he would think of putting the tourist on a level with the discoverer who first

reached the hitherto unknown goal only after years of search and sacrifice. There is no credit in making an egg stand on end after a Columbus has shown the way.

And so in Newman's case. He, too, was a pioneer, a pathfinder, for those outside the pale of the true Church, in the delivery of God's Word. What he said might not have been so wonderful to a Catholic audience; though we are not so sure even of that; for, after all, not every Catholic preacher, by any means, could surpass Newman's real Catholicity of tone and spirit, even in the writings and utterances of his Anglican career. But the main point is that, at the time, Newman was a Protestant, and his hearers were Protestants, and his sermons were a veritable revelation to them. Never did man, since the day which saw the consummation of the great schism, speak in a church of the Establishment as this man spake at St. Mary's, Oxford.

Again, what he said seventy and eighty years ago, might not prove so startling today, even if said by one like himself, and to an Anglican congregation; because, to repeat the words of Father Copeland: "Many things, indeed, contained in these volumes have become, from the very readiness of their first acceptance, and from their gradual reception into the current of religious thought, so familiar that it requires some retrospect of the time previous to their appearance to appreciate the original freshness, etc. . . . and to understand the degree in which they have acted, like leaven, on the mind and language and literature of the church in this country, and have marked an era in her history." Anglicans are accustomed to such thoughts and expressions nowadays, precisely because Newman's thoughts and expressions have become part and parcel of religious literature wherever the English language is spoken or read. When we bear in mind the testimony of those who had every means of knowing the effect of these sermons, who themselves formed part of the great preacher's audience, we can realize, to some extent at least, the unusualness of the discourses at the time of their delivery; we can understand readily that, for those who were wont to listen only to the dry and superficial sermonizing of the typical Anglican divine, Newman's

talks were an entirely new departure, and struck an entirely new note in the harmony of religion. Just imagine a Protestant minister preaching, almost with the faith and love of a Catholic priest, on the reverence due to the Blessed Virgin and the saints generally, attendance on holy communion, unworthy communions, etc.!

Cardinal Wiseman, in his article on "The Parables of the New Testament," (written for the *Dublin Review*, Sept. 1849) remarks that "only a Catholic can thoroughly realize them [the parables] or apply them. A Protestant may see in them just as much as the Jew did," and no more. Every careful student of Newman's sermons knows that, to one Protestant at least, this statement of Dr. Wiseman rarely applies. Newman's interpretation of the parables is generally quite Catholic. Take, for instance, the parable of the net cast into the sea and gathering fishes of every kind, good and bad. This and the analogous parable of the cockle growing side by side with the wheat till the harvest time, Wiseman makes the test, or touchstone, of the truth of his contention: "There has never been any founder of a false sect," he says, "who has not promised and pretended to make a perfect system . . . the elect alone have to reign, or even to exist; vice and evil are to disappear before their doctrines and rule. . . . This false principle is essentially in every heresy; it lurked in the early sects; it appeared palpably in Novatianism and Montanism; but it incarnated itself in Donatism. The basis of that heresy was that the Church could consist only of incorrupt members. . . . Protestantism is essentially Donatist, whether in its high-church theory of branch separation from the trunk, or in its lowest evangelical idea of an invisible elect church. Where was the confutation of this dangerous theory to be found? In the parables which we have arranged . . . the likening of the Kingdom of Heaven to a net gathering all sorts of fishes which are separated only on the shore."

Now take Newman's sermon on this very identical parable, (Sermon XV, Vol. III, pp. 206-208—preached in the first half of the thirties, at least fifteen years before Wiseman's article appeared) and you will find proof positive that Newman at



least did not come under Dr. Wiseman's indictment: "Also they (the first Christians) had the experience of their own and former times to show them, as in type, that in the Church evil will always mingle with the good. Thus, at the flood, there were eight men in the Ark, and one of them was reprobate; out of twelve apostles, one was a devil; out of seven deacons, one (as it is said) fell away into heresy; out of twelve tribes, one is dropped at the final sealing. These intimations, however, were not sufficient to realize to them—before the event, the serious and awful truth implied in the text, *viz.*, that the warfare which Christ began between His little flock and the world should be, in no long while, transferred into the Church itself, and be carried on by members of that Church with one another. This, I say, the early Christians did not see fulfilled, as our eyes see it; and so hard is it to possess ourselves of a true conviction about it, that even at this day, when it may be plainly seen, men will not see it. They will not so open and surrender their minds to divine truth, as to admit that the holy Church has unholy members, that blessings are given to the unworthy, that 'the Kingdom of Heaven is like a net that gathers of every kind.' They evade this mysterious appointment in various ways. Sometimes they deny that bad men are really in God's Church, which they think consists only of good men. They have invented an Invisible Church, distinct and complete at present, and peopled by saints only—as if Scripture said one word, anywhere, of a spiritual body existing in this world separate from, and independent of, the Visible Church; and they consider the Visible Church to be nothing but a mere part of this world, an establishment, sect, or party." Surely, sound and orthodox and complete enough to have come from the pen of Dr. Wiseman himself.

There is one other characteristic of these sermons which is well worth noting—one, too, in which the reader of today has an advantage over Newman's immediate hearers, for the simple reason that it was a matter of the future, a prediction whose fulfilment they could not possibly foresee, but which *we* have seen fulfilled. I refer to Newman's remarkable gift of prognosis, of which Father Copeland writes: "But, besides their

relation to the past, it will be seen in their republication how the spirit which dictated them (the sermons) pierced here and there through the cloud which hung over the future, and how the author warned us, with somewhat of prophetic forecast, of impending trials and conflicts, and of perplexities and dangers, then only dimly seen or unheeded, of which it has been reserved to the present generation to witness the nearer approach." 5

And not in his sermons only, but on many other occasions as well, did Newman show himself possessed of this wondrous foresight much akin to prophecy. To mention a few out of many instances: he showed it by anticipating Darwin and other modern evolutionists, in his seven notes or marks of a genuine development; ("Development of Doctrine") he showed it by anticipating and fore-casting the Catholic University policy of the present. As Wilfrid Ward puts it: (*Life of Newman*, p. 368) "Speaking broadly, Dr. Cullen seems to have aimed at the exclusion of all that was dangerous in modern thought; Newman rather at such mental and moral training as would enable Catholics to face dangers which were, in the long run, inevitable. 'If then a University is a direct preparation for this world' (Newman had written in his Lectures on the Scope and Nature of University Education), 'let it be what it professes. It is not a convent; it is not a seminary; it is a place to fit men of the world for the world. We cannot possibly keep them from plunging into the world with all its ways and principles and maxims, when their time comes; but we can prepare them against what is inevitable; and it is not the way to learn to swim in troubled waters never to have gone into them.'"

When, in the first flush and fever of their new-made discoveries, (real and imaginary) some of the most prominent physical scientists of his day wrote and talked in such a vein as to alarm even the elect; when a mutual misunderstanding between the representatives of theology and the coryphaei of "science" led both elements to believe that the twain were mutually antag-

\* Newman himself seems to have been aware of his gift of almost prophetic foresight; for Ward tells us he often used to say: "I write for the future."

onistic, when many began to fear that the doom of the Sacred Book was sealed, Newman was one of the few who remained perfectly calm and serene and unafraid throughout. We know now that it was all the result of a misunderstanding; Newman knew it then. He didn't believe in rushing headlong into print to contradict or explain every new theory or hypothesis brought forth. Patience was his motto; let them alone for a brief while, and things will eventually right themselves; solvitur ambulando. And the sequel proved that he was right. "How often has the wish risen in his heart," (he writes in the *Apologia*, p. 262) "that some one from among his own people should come forward as the champion of revealed truth against its opponents! Various persons, Catholic and Protestant, have asked me to do so myself; but I had several strong difficulties in the way. One of the greatest is this, that at the moment it is so difficult to say precisely what it is that is to be encountered and overthrown. I am far from denying that scientific knowledge is really growing, but it is by fits and starts; hypotheses rise and fall; it is difficult to anticipate which of them will keep their ground, and what the state of knowledge in relation to them will be from year to year. In this condition of things, it has seemed to me to be very undignified for a Catholic to commit himself to the work of chasing what might turn out to be phantoms; and, in behalf of some special objections, to be ingenious in devising a theory which, before it was completed, might have to give place to some theory newer still, from the fact that those former objections had already come to naught under the uprising of others. It seemed to be specially a time in which Christians had a call to be patient, in which they had no other way of helping those who were alarmed, than that of exhorting them to have a little faith and fortitude and to 'beware' as the poet says, 'of dangerous steps.' . . . 'Fear ye not, stand still; the Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace.'"

Quite a while, not only before agnosticism became popular, but even before it was known as such at all, Newman foresaw its coming. "The word 'agnostic' was not then known. Yet the tendency it expresses had long been noted by Newman. He

foresaw its rapid spread. . . . We are in our own day familiar with Professor Huxley's comparison of theological speculation to conjectures as to the politics of the inhabitants of the moon. It is almost startling to see how closely this jibe of Huxley's in the eighties was anticipated by Newman in the fifties. It is set forth by him in an address entitled, 'A Form of Infidelity of the Day.' 'I may be describing a school of thought in its fully developed proportions,' he writes, 'which at present every one to whom membership with it is imputed will at once begin to disown, and I may be pointing to teachers whom no one will be able to descry. Still, it is not less true that I may be speaking of tendencies and elements which exist, and he may come in person at last who comes at first to us merely in his spirit and in his power.' (Ward's *Life of Newman*, p. 392.) And he goes on to portray the agnostic of today just as we have all come to know him.

The antagonism between theologians and scientists, however, did not prevent Newman from recognizing the value of real scientific achievement, or from foreseeing the good results that would accrue from it as soon as it had found its proper place. "The most conservative theologians," says Ward, (*Life*, p. 401) "among Protestants as well as Catholics, were inclined to regard the new theories of the time as aggressions on theology, to be repelled. Newman, on the contrary, saw very early that, with whatever incidental extravagances, they represented a fruitful activity, a real advance in the positive sciences, although they were doubtless used by the type of scientists represented a few years later by Huxley and Tyndall, as weapons of attack on current orthodoxy."

To conclude: multitudes have admired and marveled at Newman's wonderful intellect, at the depth and variety of his learning, his powers of reasoning, his matchless style, his mastery of English prose, etc. His vigorous and unassailable defense of the Church, in his lectures on "The Present Position of Catholics in England," with its strong vein of humor, and its cultured irony; and the thorough-going honesty, sincerity and human interest of the *Apologia*, may hold the thousands spell-bound. But, for some few of us at least, Newman's sermons

deserve to rank among the greatest and best of his works, and even among the wonders of his age. And, after duly weighing and considering them, we must be firmly convinced that the Oxford University Sermons, and even more particularly, the Parochial and Plain Sermons delivered at St. Mary's, by Newman the Anglican, went a very great way towards preparing the soil and sowing the seed of sound doctrine, and ultimately bringing about the Renaissance of Catholicity in England.

JOHN E. GRAHAM.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795,**  
Vol. I. **The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795.** By the Reverend Peter Guilday, Docteur ès Sciences Morales et Historiques (Louvain), Instructor in Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Longmans, Green and Co., London and New York. 1914. 8vo., pp. liv + 480.

This work is valuable not only because of its subject but because it affords the key to a proper understanding of more than two centuries of English Catholicism. The enforcement of the dangerous principle of Protestantism, *cujus regio illius religio*, meant the extinction of Catholicism in those countries in which the ruling class had accepted the doctrines of the reformers. In England the principle found concrete expression in two acts of Parliament,—the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity. By the Act of Supremacy the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the realm was vested in the crown, and by the Act of Uniformity, the manner of worship was prescribed. In the face of these enactments English Catholics had no choice but apostacy or proscription. For large numbers the latter took the form of voluntary exile. The motive of their exodus was not so much fear of punishment at home, as the hope of being able, while following the dictates of conscience, to provide means of ministering to the spiritual needs of those who remained behind. One phase of this movement, and the most important, is dealt with in this study, namely, the Ecclesiastical Foundations in the Catholic Low Countries. The work is divided into thirteen chapters. In the first an excellent account is given of the real character of the movement, the purposes of the exiles, and the difficulties which beset them. The expatriation of numbers of English men and women for religion's sake, was resented at home. It met with languid interest on the continent, and was constantly exposed to the danger of being drawn into the political intrigues of the time; but in spite of all these obstacles, the movement preserved its primitive character and purpose and remained strong and vigorous until the doubtful blessing of the French Revolution, restored many of the exiles to England. There

they gave inspiration to that revival of Catholicism which made such powerful strides in the nineteenth century. It is no small merit to have analyzed the true character of this movement, and it is a great achievement to have set it forth so clearly and impartially as we find it here.

In the remaining chapters eleven religious Foundations in the Low Countries are discussed, viz.: The English College at Douay, the Carthusians, the Bridgettines of Syon, the Jesuits, the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Monks and Nuns of the Order of St. Benedict, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, the Canonesses of St. Augustine, the Canonesses of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Dominicans. In each a short summary of the circumstances surrounding the expulsion from England and the establishment on the Continent precedes the history of the trials and struggles of more than two hundred years, the destruction of the continental foundations and the resumption of activity in England. The work of Dr. Guilday supersedes all that has hitherto been written on this subject, and because of the use of stores of new material gives it a fresh and unique significance. The tone of the book is constructive and unbiassed. By its broad and thorough scholarship it fittingly takes its place in the magnificent series of historical monographs which have issued from the Historical Seminar of the University of Louvain, and it exhibits all the characteristics which distinguish the work of Canon Cauchie the head of the Seminar and his many learned disciples. A particularly striking character in this work is seen in the fact that it offers a systematic presentation of a subject which has hitherto been dealt with superficially or piecemeal. It is the fruit of laborious research in archives and libraries, and the product of careful sifting of manifold sources which are unavailable to any but special students. It bears on every page the evidence of tireless industry and scholarly purpose. It marks out the great lines of a subject which cannot fail to become more engrossing as it becomes better known. All the elements which contributed to the English Catholic Diaspora are reduced to their proper form and place, and it is not too much to expect that Dr. Guilday's work will be the nucleus round which a multitude of special subsidiary studies dealing with details will grow up in the near future. In addition a valuable chapter is supplied on the history of the political aspects of Protestantism.

The enumeration and classification of the copious source material

and the extensive Bibliography which are prefixed to the book, the careful and discriminating analysis of the problems, and the judicious arrangement of the subject matter ought to stimulate the interest and the literary activity of Catholics in this field. The study of the Foundation Movement is a splendid contribution to Catholic historical literature. No work of recent times better deserves a place on Catholic bookshelves. It is suitable for the general reader as well as the scholar and is essential to everybody who desires to know the condition of Catholicism in places subject to English influence not only in the past but at the present time.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**The Protestant Churches.** Their Founders, Histories and Developments. How the Reformation Spread. The Beliefs, Practices, Customs and Forms of Worship of the Different Denominations. Their Ministers, Congregations, Membership and Cost of Building. By the Reverend James Luke Meagher, D.D., President of the Christian Press Association. Christian Press Association: New York. Pp. 653.

It would not be just to conclude from the title of this book that it is a mere colorless directory of protestant sects and heresies. The enumeration of the many protestant associations is fairly complete, and the author sets forth his characterization of them in vigorous terms. It demanded patience and industry to have drawn up the mere list of these numerous protestant bodies, but not only has this been accomplished, but succinct histories of each are given together with statistical references wherever available to their present numbers and distribution. Every page is characterized by a distinctly polemical tone. The reader is carried on from some general considerations regarding the Church and its enemy, sectarianism, through the histories of Luther, Calvin and the other reformers down to some of the present-day growths, notably the Christian Science Church of Mrs. Eddy. The work ought to act as a counterpoise to the violent anti-Catholic propaganda which has been so actively carried on in certain protestant circles of late.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---



**Manuel de sociologie catholique, d'après les documents pontificaux.** M. le Chanoine P. Poey. Beauchesne, Paris, 1914.

**Cours de doctrine et de pratique sociales.** X<sup>e</sup> Session. Versailles, 1913. Paris, Gabalda.

1. This Manual presents an excellent summary of Catholic doctrine and documents, together with excursions into the field of economics, theology, political science and social reform in as far as the Catholic Church is called upon to give expression to her attitudes. The author presents Sociology as a science which offers principles and direction of life rather than observation and description of it. Since the term Sociology is used in widely different senses by writers, no fault may be found with Dr. Poey in his use of the name. It may be well, however, to advise the reader that the volume does not take into account in any manner, the modern literature and the theories that are known in academic circles, under the name Sociology.

Judging the volume by its professed purpose, one must give it credit for conciseness and completeness and authority. Since the treatise follows very closely the approved lines of thought and action which obtain in Catholic circles, there is little need of entering upon any detail with a view either to judge or to commend the volume. It is a very creditable contribution to the rich and helpful literature for which we must thank our friends in France.

The reviewer would have been pleased (if his preference may be alluded to without impropriety), had the author taken into account certain modern developments which require, whether or not we will it, a restatement of doctrine. For instance, the chapter on Private Property restates our traditional doctrine briefly and clearly. It does not, however, test that doctrine by the fundamental features of modern Private Property. The separation of ownership from management in modern industrial property, control of industrial policy by majority stock and corresponding impotence of the minority, the inability of vast numbers to acquire property, the complicated relations of the modern credit system to the institutions of property, the vast increase in State activity creating many new forms of social property which supplement Private Property, and other features of the problem compel us to restate our doctrine although they do not compel us to change any of its essential features. This is a service which modern empirical

Sociology ventures to perform, and at the same time, it is an advantage of which the author's method naturally deprives him.

In like manner, one misses in the author's discussion of the family, of war, of poverty, of distribution of wealth, such attention to the rich, modern, sociological literature on these and related subjects, as would furnish insight into the overpowering social processes which demand recognition in every attempt at moral and spiritual leadership in modern society.

These observations are made without any desire to underrate the service that Dr. Poey has rendered in publishing his *Manual*. Within its self-imposed limits, one may not refuse to it its meed of praise. Occasion may be taken, however, to say that the interests of the Church and the promotion of her social power, seem to require that we take into account increasingly the results of modern technical sociological scholarship in as far as these concern any restatement of our doctrine.

2. This volume presents an account of the meeting of the *Semaine Sociale* (Social Week) at Versailles in 1913. For the past ten years, it has visited annually the larger cities of France in the hope of stimulating local interest and organization as factors in the social and spiritual progress of France. There is scarcely a fundamental problem of social reform, of either theoretical or practical kind, which this busy and powerful organization has not touched during the few years of its existence. The meeting at Versailles undertook an exhaustive discussion of the theory of moral responsibility. The philosophy, theology and psychology of responsibility; its social and legal aspects; the responsibility of parents, of priest, of teacher, of employer, of laborer, of landowner, of writer, of consumer, is discussed in a thorough-going and practical way. Lest the list be incomplete, a chapter is added discussing with good humor and real point, those in attendance at the meeting of the *Semaine*. The discussions take account of modern social forces and processes in a way that adds a touch of reality to the entire volume. It may be commended without qualification for its service in setting forth the theory of responsibility in a day which is much inclined to ignore it, and the practical aspects of responsibility in a time when even those who would gladly do their duty, meet endless confusion in attempting to find out what it is.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

**Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan;  
Part III: Cuneiform Bullae of the third millenium B. C.,  
by Clarence E. Keyser, New York, 1914.**

Most of the texts published in this excellent volume belong to the time of the Ur Dynasty and are written in the Sumerian language. They come from collections originally found in Drehem and Jokha, cities to the southeast of Nippur, in Senkereh and Sippar, and may be divided into four general classes: 1, Bullae or Labels; 2, Tags in the shape of tablets; 3, Archive Labels; 4, Animal Tags. The first two classes were used chiefly in connection with the various receipts and expenditures of the temple; the archives labels are related to the filing cases for the temple records, and the animal tags, tied around the neck or horns of the animal, were used to indicate ownership. The book contains a descriptive catalogue of 190 specimens, the autographic reproduction of the 190 texts together with the transliteration and translation of 25 of them. To this have been added 8 plates giving heliotype reproductions of some tablets from each of the four groups. A very useful feature of the book is the general index of personal names, names of gods, temples, officials, places and months. This volume is a splendid contribution to our knowledge of the religion and customs of the ancient peoples of Babylonia and is another evidence of Mr. Morgan's munificent generosity in making available to Oriental scholars the priceless treasures of his library.

A. VASCHALDE.

**Realia Biblica geographica, naturalia, archaeologica, quibus  
compendium introductionis completur et illustratur, auctore  
Martino Hagen, S. I. In 8 (viii + 728 pp.) Frs. 10.00.**

This volume intends to complete and illustrate the *Compendium introductionis biblicae*, written originally by the Rev. Rudolph Cornely and published from the sixth edition by the Rev. Martin Hagen.

It treats in alphabetical order first of geographical names, then of natural sciences and finally of archaeological things as far as they concern Holy Scripture. At the end it gives a complete index of all articles treated and exhibits colored maps of the mountain of Moriah, of Palestine in the time of our Lord and the Apostles, and one representing the itinerary of St. Paul in Asia

**Minor.** Finally it adds several plans of the Tabernacle, the temples, and their parts.

The *Realia Biblica*, which are a summary of the author's *Lexicon Biblicum* in three volumes, is a model of a brief but rich source of information on geographical and other topics which are of interest to Bible readers. Brevity and conciseness, accuracy and thoroughness are its chief features and make it a very handy and reliable work for consultation.

FRANZ J. COELN.

**The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures.** The New Testament, Vol. III, Part II. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. By the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey. xvii and 72 pp. London, New York, etc. (Longmans, Green and Co.), 1914. 30 cents.

The Rheims and Douay Version which was in fact the only authentic version among the English-speaking Catholics for the last three centuries contains, as all know, many mis-translations and inappropriate renderings and can hardly be considered as the final Catholic Version in English. It is consequently a great blessing that a new translation, the so-called Westminster Version, is successfully progressing.

The last fascicle of this Westminster Version contains the translation of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The rendering, which takes into account both the Vulgate and the original text, is, generally speaking, very careful, critical, appropriate and incomparably better than the old Version. It might however be improved if the explanatory remarks within the text itself and the separate titles within the chapters were omitted. Such additions certainly should not to be found in passages whose meaning is disputed. So to mention only one instance, in Ch. 7, v. 36 ff. the Greek text followed (as the translation "let them be married" shows) is ambiguous, the subject of *ὑπέρακμος*, perhaps being masculine and the meaning of *ὑπέρακμος*, possibly being "abounding in strength"; but this ambiguity is removed entirely by the rendering "she being past her youth" and by the addition in brackets. It seems to me that the translation should be as ambiguous as the original text, perhaps something like the following "having attained the fullness of youth," and the explanatory remarks should find their legitimate place in the footnote.

The footnotes (in which the translator is not afraid to use Greek) are very good, condensed but clear and sufficient, and indeed form a sort of brief commentary mostly of a scientific, not polemic character. The translation is preceded by a short introduction and followed by two Appendices, a short one by the author on the Vulgate reading in I Cor. xv, 51 and the other, a rather extensive one, by the Rev. A. Keogh, on the ministry in the Apostolic Church.

Let us here express the hope that the Westminster Version will be very soon completed and supplant the Rheims-Douay Version by its own superior merit.

FRANZ J. COELN.

---

**Hugh Pope. The Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible. The Old Testament.** New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, Benziger Brothers, 1913. xlv and 465 pp. Price \$1.35.

Right in the beginning of this review I want to emphasize the value of the modest little volume of Father Hugh Pope. It is, I have no hesitation in saying, one of the best or at least one of the most practical books for Bible students and Bible lovers. True, there are many other works, mostly voluminous and expensive, which are deeper in research and more extensive in subject and form, but there is none which to my knowledge at least, presents in such a practical way so many things worth knowing and often looked for in vain, in so small a space and for so low a price.

The introductory part of Fr. Pope's work consists of the Preface written by the Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Bourne, the wonderful encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII "Providentissimus Deus" of Nov. 18, 1893, and a short introduction written by himself. The first chapter contains in the first twenty-one pages instructive notices on the Bible in general, the number, order and arrangement of the books, Biblical history and Chronology. In the following four pages the author gives a list of the Fathers of the Church who have commented on the Bible, also of Commentators and Critics, both Catholic or Protestant. In the rest of the chapter we find brief but valuable information on the historical sources, biblical and non-biblical, for Old Testament subjects. In the nine pages which follow there is a literary table mentioning the chief documents in stone or clay or papyrus that may have bearing on biblical subjects, from 4000 B. C. up to the time of Christ. A few

of the most important of these documents are treated of in short sketches, as for instance the Code of Hammurabi, the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, the Meshastone, the Siloam Inscription, and the Assouan Papyri. The second and third chapters deal with the essentials on hermaneutics and the texts and versions, laying special stress upon the Anglo-Saxon and English translations. In the fourth chapter, Fr. Pope presents the more important facts about the Babylonians and Assyrians, Egypt and the Egyptians, the Hittites, Philistines, Phoenicia and the Phoenicians, the Moabites, Ammonites, Syria and the Syrians, and Idumaea and the Edomites. The topics of the fifth chapter are Hebrew notions of time, the feasts and fasts, the calendar, the High Priest and the sacrifices, Hebrew moneys, coins, weights and measures. In chapter 6 we find, after a short mention of the *Motu Proprio* of Nov. 18, 1907, "Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae" on the authority attaching to the decrees of the Biblical Commission, all the decrees of this Commission from February 13, 1905, on to May 1, 1910, in so far as they touch upon Old Testament books or problems. The chapters 7-10 contain a kind of a short so-called special introduction to the individual books of the Old Testament. Many tables, eight maps, a sketch on the topography of Jerusalem, a list of proper names differently spelled in the different versions, an index of biblical texts and an extensive one of subjects happily complete and perfect the book.

I have purposely given an elaborate conspectus of the various matters which are contained in Pope's book. I want to recommend it to our theological students and to all Catholic Bible readers and Bible lovers, both ecclesiastics and laymen, and to do this I thought it best to describe all that is contained within its few pages. I must also add that Fr. Pope's *Aids* are not only extensive and cover many more matters than could be properly expected, but also that the whole work is extremely practical and very well done, because of its clearness and brevity, its good arrangement and scholarly treatment. The *Aids* surely will be welcome to everybody who is old fashioned enough to think that the Bible is still the soul and the foundation of Theology, and that the written Word of God is still interesting enough and worthy to be read, studied and understood.

I sincerely hope that very soon a second edition and many others will follow, and because I hope so, I feel compelled to point

out a few things which should be changed or improved in the following editions.

First of all, there is almost no reference to the literature on the different matters treated. No one, of course, could reasonably expect long and complete lists of books dealing with the matters and problems in question, but everyone would desire to see at least one or two leading books on the subject in question mentioned. Fr. Pope's *Aids* should help to find out just the right book for further study. This would not very much increase the size of the book. The list of the Fathers, Commentators and Critics, given on pages 21-24, is only a poor and altogether insufficient substitute, the more so, since it is not judiciously selected. I will not judge whether or not every name mentioned really deserves a place in the list. I will suppose that everyone does, but in this case there are numerous other commentators and critics of the last two centuries who deserve a place in the list. Names like Cornely, von Hume-lauer and Knabenbauer, or Delitzsch, Dillmann, Graf, Reuss and Wellhausen and many others should not be absent. Moreover, if this list were to be really useful, not only name and date of death of the commentators should be mentioned, but also some data descriptive of the man and his work should be added, which could easily be done in two or three additional lines for each.

Then one does not like to miss a short notice on the Peshitta and the Coptic and other Oriental versions. Fr. Pope is certainly justified, writing for English-speaking Bible readers, to deal extensively with the English versions and especially that of Douay and Rheims, but other versions of immensely higher value should not be forgotten.

Furthermore, there is nothing at all about the most important Pentateuchal question and the different schools and systems of solving it, from Astruc and Spinoza to Graf-Wellhausen and their followers. Most of the space which he devotes to the official edition of the Vulgate by Sixtus V and Gregory XIV and the part which Bellarmine takes in it, certainly would have been better used for the points mentioned just above.

There are many other points which one would like to see treated differently, but there is no need of mentioning them, because they are mostly matters in which personal taste and subjective feeling are concerned. This applies chiefly to the chapters devoted to the special introductions to the individual books.

To conclude this review, I repeat emphatically that Fr. Pope's

*Aids*, as a whole, is a splendid work, considering the practical end he had in view. Whoever applies himself to its study, will gratefully realize how much real aid it brings him.

The make-up of the book is good, and the price fair.

FRANZ J. COELN.

---

**Henri Lesêtre. Le temple de Jérusalem.** Paris, 1912. VIII and 216 pages.

The end that the author has in view, is, as he puts it in his preface, not to give "une description technique et raisonnée" of the temples of Solomon and Herod. He aims at informing the readers of the Gospel on the traditional form of worship among the ancient Jews and on the framework of that worship. He wants to throw more light on certain passages of the holy text to show how, through Christ, the ancient religious tradition, attaching man to God, was transformed and continued until it reached us.

To this end he presents in the introductory chapter a condensed view of the places of worship of the ancient Hebrews, especially the tabernacle and the temples of Solomon and Zorobabel. In the other three chapters he treats of the temple of Herod, the service in the temple and the history of the Herodian temple. The whole treatise, which is of the nature of a short résumé, can of course not do away with the necessity of consulting other scientific works on the same subject for deeper studies; it has, however, the merit of simplicity and clearness both in form and language and will prove itself a practical aid to the average Bible student. Twenty-four illustrations and an alphabetical index are useful and appreciable additions.

FRANZ J. COELN.

---

**Breaking with the Past, or Catholic Principles Abandoned at the Reformation,** by Francis A. Gasquet, Abbot-President of the English Benedictines. N. Y., Kenedy and Sons, 1914. 16mo, 84 pp.

This interesting little volume contains the four sermons which the learned author, honored since with the Cardinalate, preached in St. Patrick's Cathedral, N. Y., during the Lenten season of 1913. The continuity of the Anglican Church with the Church in



England in pre-reformation times is a favorite theme with many modern Anglicans. It is to show the untenableness of this position that these sermons were delivered. One proof of this is given in the first sermon, which tells how Henry VIII, by a series of aggressions, finally secured the Supreme Head Act, whereby the crown, and not the Holy See, was declared to exercise supreme jurisdiction in the realm in matters spiritual. This rejection of Papal supremacy was a radical break with the past. It was forced on clergy and people by a despotic king.

In the second sermon we are told how in the reign of Edward VI another radical change was made,—the substitution for the missal of the prayer book of Edward VI, in which all reference to the Mass as a sacrifice was studiously excluded, it being the intention of those who made the change to abolish the Mass and have in its stead simply a commemorative communion rite.

In the third sermon, attention is called to a corresponding radical change in the ceremony of ordination. Not long after the prayer book of Edward VI, a new ordinal was drawn up and sanctioned by law, in which was excluded every word suggesting that the candidate was ordained to be a sacrificing priest.

Then, as we learn in the fourth sermon, came in the reign of Elizabeth the Act of Uniformity in religion, exposing to the penalty of death priests who should be convicted of having celebrated Mass. Thus in regard to Papal supremacy, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the sacrificial priesthood, the Church of England under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth became radically different from what it had been before. It lost all right to claim continuity with the Church of former times.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Predigten und Ansprachen zunächst für die jugend gebildeter Stände,** von Msgr. Dr. Paul Baron de Mathies. Dritter Band. Freiburg-St. Louis, Herder, 1913. 8vo., 455 pp. \$1.65 net.

Of the forty-two sermons and addresses contained in this volume, there are some appropriate for the first six Sundays after Epiphany and others suited to the fifth and following Sundays after Pentecost. The author knows how to preach. His matter is solid and vital, by preference moral subjects. He draws abundantly from the common experiences of Christian life. His thoughts flow

clearly, easily, naturally, with now and then a touch of playfulness. He expresses himself in a style that is direct, clear and forceful. To those familiar with German these sermons will make attractive reading, and will suggest not a few good thoughts for the Sunday sermon.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Half-Hour with God's Heroes, or Stories from the Sacred Books**, by Thomas D. Williams. Baltimore, Murphy, 1913. 12mo, 260 pp.

The favorite book for children is the story book. Adventures however strange, happenings however marvelous, are most acceptable to the child mind. The easiest way of making children familiar with much of the history and with many of the personages of the Old Testament is to tell them the striking stories in which the Old Testament abounds. Father Williams does this in the present volume. In a series of thirty-two half-hour talks, he relates in plain language suited to children the wonderful experiences ascribed to the noted men and women whose deeds made them famous in the history of God's chosen people. The book is supplied with abundant illustrations, most of them appropriate.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**From the Sepulchre to the Throne**, by Madame Cecilia. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1914. 12mo, 427 pp.

This volume is a continuation of the series of pious readings or meditations on the redemptive work of Christ published two years ago under the title, "Looking on Christ the Lamb of God." In the latter book the reader was invited to contemplate the recorded happenings to Jesus from the time of His Baptism to His burial in the tomb. The present volume takes the reader in spirit to the eve of the Resurrection and carries him through the stirring experiences of the first Easter, the glorious Ascension and the intervening period so weighty with important instruction for the apostles. Here as in the previous volume, the material is so arranged as to serve both as a book of spiritual reading and one of meditation. After each chapter comes a convenient summary under three heads, preceded by the two preludes calculated to put

one in the presence of God, and followed by the colloquy or special prayer suggested by the subject matter of the meditation. Each study is serious and careful, breathing the spirit of sound piety. A graceful style bears the reader pleasantly on. There is much that is suggestive, much that is apt to edify. The topical settings, based on a careful study of the best authors, lend vividness to the descriptions. The book, together with its companion volume, deserves a wide reading.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Johannes Evangelium.** Belser. Das Zeugnis des vierten Evangelisten fuer die Taufe, Eucharistie und Geistessendung. Mit Entwuerfen zu Predigten ueber die Eucharistie. Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1912. xii + 294 pp. Price, \$1.30.

Rev. Dr. Belser, Professor at Tuebingen University, the renowned author of many important works on New Testament exegesis, presents a new book which proves again that he well deserves his reputation as one of the foremost Catholic New Testament exegetes in Germany. This book treats in its first part (pp. 1-164) of the testimony of the fourth Gospel on Baptism, (John, ch. 1-4), the Eucharist (John ch. 6; John, ch. 3, 13-17; John, 4, 20-24; John 13, 1) and the sending of the Holy Ghost (sacrament of confirmation, John 4, 10; John 7, 37; John 14, 16; John 15, 26; John 16, 7). The explanations of the testimonies on Baptism and Eucharist are in fact extensive commentaries on the relative passages in view of their relation to these two sacraments. Even if one might not entirely agree with the author in his conception of the *πνεῦμα* (John 3, 8) or *ἀνωθεν* (John 3, 3) and other minor points, he will easily concede that his deductions are convincing as a whole, and certainly deep, most enlightening and satisfactory.

In the second part (pp. 164-289) the author wants to demonstrate in practical examples how the Eucharistic passages may be utilized for preaching. Thus he presents model sermons on them: pp. 164-177 on John 6, 1-15, pp. 177-186 on John 6, 26-35, pp. 198-211 and 211-219 on John 6, 48-54 (the Eucharist, nourishment of the soul for eternal life; the Eucharist, the sacrifice of the New Testament), pp. 219-221, 229-237 and 237-243 on John 6, 55-69 (the Eucharist, a real repast; the duty of taking part in the Eucharistic repast; effects of the worthy reception of Holy Communion) pp. 243-254 and 254-262, on John 13, 1-20 (institution of the Euchar-

ist; preparation for Holy Communion). To these model sermons he adds one by Bishop von Linseman, delivered on the occasion of the author's first Mass. Though these sermons seem to be attractive, it may be more advisable to abstain from reviewing them, since few things depend more on subjective feeling and sentiments than the appreciation of sermons. A good index of names and subjects complete the book.

The make-up is in the customary Herder style and good; the price not too high.

---

**Commentarii in St. Pauli Epistolas ad Thessalonicenses, ad Timotheum, ad Titum et ad Philemonem.** Joseph Knabenbauer. Paris, Lethielleux, 1913. 394 pp. Price \$1.50.

This volume forms part of the *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, the edition of which was begun by the Jesuit Fathers Cornely, Knabenbauer and von Hummelauer some twenty years ago and is continued by the same and other members of the Society of Jesus. It follows, therefore, the same arrangement and method which is characteristic of the whole *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*. Deep erudition, scholarly treatment of current problems, mastery of the vast literature which has to be consulted on these problems, unimpassioned and objective critique of the different opinions and explanations, all these features, by which every work of Father Knabenbauer excels and which are acknowledged in him by all, show themselves also in this volume. They are too well known for anything new to be added in praise of them.

This and the other commentaries of the *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, especially those on the New Testament, deserve to occupy an honorable place in every studious priest's library. As far as I know, there are no Catholic commentaries, the use of which could possibly be more fruitful. Whoever will devote a short time every day to their study or use them for his daily meditation, will soon realize the great amount of good coming to him from them in regard to the better understanding of Holy Writ, the deepening of his knowledge of theology and help in the practical ministry.

This new volume, like the others of the *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, is well made up and cheap.

---

**Ancient Babylonia.** By C. H. W. Johns. Cambridge University Press, New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913. VIII + 148 pp. Price 40 cts.

The author's little sketch of ancient Babylonia belongs to the Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature, an imitation of the renowned collections of Goeschen, Koesel, Quelle and Meyer and others. Like the volumes of these collections, the Cambridge Manuals aim at giving the quintessence of modern research on certain subjects in a nutshell.

The author, who enjoys a good reputation among Orientalists, presents in his booklet in the first two chapters of an introductory character a summary of information on the sources for the study of Babylonia in Greek, Hebrew and Babylonian, and on its land and people. In the following eight chapters, still more summarily, he presents a sketch on the history of the different rulers and dynasties in the different Summerian and Akkadian town-kingdoms and countries, including the Neo-Babylonian empire down to Cyrus' march into Babylon, on the 3d of Marchesvan 539/8 B. C. A short bibliography, a good index and a small map complete the book.

This short sketch, though, as the author puts it, it should only be regarded as an attempt to summarize, without argument or discussion, the results now generally admitted as probable, is nevertheless a useful help for quick information on this still fragmentary results of modern scientific research on ancient Babylonia. The nine illustrations, presenting plaques, statues, steles, tablets, etc., of interest, are well selected and well made. The make-up is fair and the price reasonable.

---

**Pentateuchal Studies.** By Harold M. Wiener. Oberlin, Ohio, Bibliotheca Sacra Co., 1912. XIII + 353 pp.

Wiener's book contains twenty-three articles which had previously been published in the *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, the *Princeton Theological Review*, and especially in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. This accounts for the contents of this book which is not at all a treatise on the Pentateuchal problem, but a collection of shorter or longer studies on single points; it also accounts for the method and form in which these

points are treated. The tendency of the studies is throughout polemical against the so-called Wellhausen School.

The author proves himself to be a most able writer and well-versed in the intricacies of the many controversies on the origin and character of the Pentateuch. Without doubt his arguments are often right to the point and must not be simply disregarded nonchalantly.

Regrettable, however, is the sharp and oftentimes bitter tone in which the author addresses representatives of the Wellhausen School. It is true, just the same blame has to be put to the door of many of them, but this can scarcely be a sufficient excuse for him. Bitterness and personal attacks will never be the right means to bring about decisions in scientific controversies.

Both indices, fortunately added by the author, one of the Biblical passages (and paragraphs in Hammurabi's Code) mentioned in the studies, and the other of subjects, etc., treated of, are valuable and greatly facilitate the use of the book.

---

**United States Catholic Historical Society: Historical Records and Studies, Vol. VIII (1914). Pp. 244. New York, 1914.**

It is in no spirit of self-praise that the Catholic Record Society of London publishes in its Annual Report of the present year an interesting comparison between the number of its members and that of some of the other leading English Societies, whose object is similar in purpose and design. From the Catholic standpoint, however, there is room for much gratification that the Catholic Record Society, although the youngest among these bodies, can now boast of a larger membership than any of the others. Naturally, societies of this kind appeal to a very limited circle of readers, either of research-workers or of members of the families from whose archives the records are published. The question might be asked in this connection whether the work of the United States Catholic Historical Society, with its five hundred members—two hundred, in fact, more than its younger sister of England, is to be accepted as a sign that such studies and reprints are more popular here in America than abroad. The continuance of the Historical Records and Studies for so many years now would point to the existence of a goodly number of scholars, scattered among

our Catholic centres in the United States, who demand this kind of historical work on the sources of our ecclesiastical history.

These numerous readers of the Records and Studies will have no just cause for complaint over the contents of this Seventh Volume of the Series. Following closely the outline of the previous volumes, the articles published in its two hundred and forty pages are divisible into two groups: those dealing with American Church History; and those dealing with elementary problems, such as education, the supply of the clergy, the economic status of the parishes and dioceses, and the registers of apostolic men whose work is now bringing forth fruit a hundred-fold in the Vineyard of the United States. This present volume would be an important one, if it contained no more than the articles on the *Sulpicians in the United States*, by the editor, Dr. Herbermann, and on *Pierre d'Ailly and the Discovery of America*, by the late Canon Salembier. Dr. Herbermann gives us in this first instalment of his paper the story of Bishop Carroll's noble endeavour to grapple with the educational problem which faced his diocese in 1790. It is taken up mostly with the foundation of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, by the Sulpicians, in 1791. In a subsequent volume, no doubt, Dr. Herbermann will deal with the growth of the Sulpician Order in the United States, and will give us as clear and as interesting an account of their admirable activity in the foundation of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg; St. Charles' College, formerly at Ellicott City; St. John's Seminary, Brighton; St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers; St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park; and the Catholic University of America, where recently St. Austin's College has been begun by the same Congregation. Canon Salembier has contributed, in his article on Pierre d'Ailly, a good example of that clarity and precision of historical judgment which has made his *Le Grand Schisme d'Occident* a classic among modern historical works. The great problem of ascertaining just how much scholars and navigators of the fifteenth century knew or conjectured of the world's surface prior to 1492 has been given a prominent place in American publications during the past few years; and allied to this problem is the equally fascinating one of the influence or influences which strengthened Columbus in the purpose which carried him across unknown seas to his goal. Among these problematical influences, Canon Salembier discusses the celebrated *Imago Mundi* of d'Ailly, and brings forward the different hypotheses regarding the time when Columbus became

acquainted with this well-known treatise. The learned Professor of Lille proves his general conclusion that Columbus was indebted to Pierre d'Ailly "for everything, or nearly everything, and the *Imago Mundi* was his favorite book."

Parochial and diocesan records receive an important share in this Seventh Volume, and the sketch of *Holy Trinity Parish*, Boston, by Paul Linehan, is a type of research work which is much needed for the study of Church History in the United States. Other articles of merit are: *Fra Junipero Serra*, by Ann Judge; the *San Blas Indians*, by Rev. H. C. Pouget; and Professor Fisher's important notes on the *Results of my Cartographical Investigations*. The *canard*, which was bruited abroad some years ago, on the pretended Jewish parentage of Columbus is dealt with effectively by Dr. Herbermann. Father Michael O'Connor, S. J., has written a very readable essay on the foundation of *Creighton University*, which contains incidentally much that is new for the study of the missions in the Northwest. At page 160, a photogravure, belonging to the article on the *San Blas Indians*, has been displaced, and the displacement detracts from the general neatness of the volume. Father Campbell, S. J., has accomplished so much of late years for the revival of genuine interest in Canadian history that anything from his versatile pen finds an eager public. In *Le Moyne d'Iberville*, we come into intimate acquaintanceship with that fascinating hero, Pierre le Moyne d'Iberville, who founded the French colony of Louisiana, in 1699, and who called one place on his way down to the mouth of the Mississippi by the facetious name of "Baton Rouge," because of a *red stick* which marked the boundary line between two of the Indian tribes.

With the swift advance historical research has made the past twenty years, American Catholic historians desiderate more and more such volumes of original research as this; but what is even more valuable would be the constant help such societies as the United States Catholic Historical Society could give us in opening up to our knowledge archdiocesan, diocesan, and community or family archives, by publishing summary and detailed analyses of their contents. Too much of this sort of work is being done by non-sectarian bodies, such as the Carnegie Institution and State Historical Societies, for Catholic scholars to lag behind. The *Carnegie Guide to the Study of Materials in Roman and Italian Archives* for example, places upon Catholic scholars a lasting debt of gratitude, and such perfect research-work is worthy of our



closest imitation. In much that is done by Catholic Historical Societies, with but one or two exceptions, the work is faulty, owing to the lack of a corresponding apparatus, such as indexes, biographical and bibliographical data. The usefulness of this Seventh Volume, for instance, is vitiated by the absence of an index; and, with the one exception of Canon Salembier's article, there is nowhere an adequate bibliography. The Catholic Record Society of London has set an example which should be followed, if we are to reap any reward from the labors of the pioneers in this all-important field of American Catholic history.

P. G.

---

**Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique, sous la direction de A. d'Alès. Paris, Beauchesne, 1914. Fascicule X.**

In the tenth part of the new Apologetic Dictionary, recently issued from the press, the high standard of excellence set by the previous numbers is for the most part happily maintained. It opens with the continuation of the comprehensive article on ecclesiastical education. The fourth section of this article, on the educative work of the Church during the periods of the Renaissance and the Reformation, by F. Sagot, offers a fine historic survey of this interesting field of the Church's activity, and is supplemented with a rich bibliography. The fifth section, on the struggle of the Church in France for freedom of education, is the work of F. Gibbon. It tells of the progressive laicization of the schools in France, and the noble efforts of the hierarchy and people to set up and maintain free Christian schools. The bibliography of this section is also rich and comprehensive. The sixth section, by M. Turman, gives valuable information on the development of organizations and clubs of young men and women with the view to foster Christian faith and the practice of religion. The seventh section treats of the Catholic Universities existing throughout the world. This treatise, by Mgr. A. Baudrillart, is little more than a reprint of a series of articles published in the *Correspondent* in 1909. He there essayed a short description of the Catholic University of America, and touched on the attitude of the Catholic youth of this country towards higher education. The whole was shallow and superficial, bristling with inaccuracies. It is a pity that in writing anew in 1914, no ray of light from America should illumine his mental vision. The blundering see-

tions of his original essay are reproduced almost word for word. He knows nothing about the wonderful growth of the University in the last three years, being content with *Minerva* statistics of the year 1910. He is ignorant of the existence at the University of the Normal School for teaching Catholic Sisters. He has no knowledge of the Summer School held under the auspices and direction of the University. The name of the rector, be it recorded, he has succeeded in mastering in part. He speaks of "the present rector, Joseph Shahan." That such a slovenly piece of work should come from the pen of one who holds the honored position of rector of the Catholic University of Paris is to be deplored. As this article was destined to serve as a source of information in a dictionary of high authority, it was his bounden duty to give a faithful description of the university as it is today, using as a basis only first-hand evidence. This evidence he could have obtained by writing to the university authorities or by examining the recent year-books, books which along with a mysterious *University Chronicle* he mentioned, indeed, in his bibliography but did not take the pains to consult. The outcome of his inexcusable neglect is this disgraceful misrepresentation of the university, an ugly blot on the fair pages of the Apologetic Dictionary.

The article on Education is followed by four short, excellent ones:—that of the Abbé de la Taille on the Catholic teaching in regard to the right of a people to resist and even overthrow established governments guilty of unjust rule; that of the Abbé P. Rousselot on the anti-Catholic character of the philosophy underlying the Modernist movement; another, by Father A. Vermeersch, S. J., on the morality of interest; and the fourth, by E. Lesne, on the struggle between Church and State in earlier times on the right of investiture. Through a curious oversight, this article is not mentioned in the table of contents.

Under the heading, the Religion of Iran, Father J. M. Lagrange, O. P., gives a reprint of his article, *la Religion des Perses*, published in two sections in the *Revue Biblique*, 1904. In this long and somewhat tedious essay, too much space is taken up with his attempt to make good his slightly modified view of Darmesteter's theory that the entire *Avesta*, the Bible of the Zoroastrian religion, is long posterior to the Jewish scriptures. The theory, if well substantiated, would dispose of the common objection that Judaism was indebted to Zoroastrianism for its eschatology and demonology. But the majority of Iranian scholars reject the theory, insisting

on the unquestionable evidence of great antiquity afforded by the *Gathas* and some other parts of the *Avesta*, while admitting the later origin of other portions. Fr. Lagrange did not need this dubious theory to disprove the alleged dependence of the Bible on the *Avesta*. In the reprint a few errata of the original essay are unfortunately reproduced. Of these the most important is the name of one of the amshaspands, Ameretât, wrongly given Ameretatât.

In happy contrast with this long-winded article is the excellent, concise account of Islam and its sects, in nine pages, by Carra de Vaux. Equally good is the short article by Father A. Brou, S. J., describing in six pages the religions of Japan.

Lack of space forbids more than the bare mention of the other articles in this fascicule,—the History of Jansenism by the Abbé de Becdelièvre, the Liquefaction of the Blood of St. Januarius, by L. Cavène, St. John Nepomucene, by the deceased Abbé Jaugy, Joan of Arc, by Canon Dunand, Pope Joan, by F. Vernet, Jephthe's Sacrifice, by Fr. Condemin, S. J., and the beginning of a long article on the Jesuits, of which the first section, by Fr. A. Brou, S. J., takes up the last few pages of this interesting fascicule.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Unemployment in Oregon: Its Nature, Extent and Remedies,**  
by Frank O'Hara, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Economics,  
Catholic University.

For the past three months Dr. O'Hara has been making a study of unemployment in Oregon under the auspices of the Oregon Committee on Seasonal Unemployment which was originated last June as a section of the American Association for Labor Legislation. A thirty-nine page pamphlet under the above title sums up the results of his work. Dr. O'Hara discusses (1) the nature of the problem of unemployment, (2) the extent of unemployment in Oregon, (3) certain measures designed to minimize unemployment or to counteract its evil effects, including (a) the shifting of the demand for labor on public works, (b) the promotion of winter industries, (c) the reorganization of employment agencies, (d) unemployment insurance (e) continuation schools, (f) cash payments, (g) relief works." It would be impossible to treat all these points adequately in a short pamphlet, and Dr. O'Hara does

not attempt to do so. After making a brief analysis of the nature of unemployment, he devotes most attention to the shifting of the demand for labor on public works and the promoting of winter industries as the most practical and easy means of counteracting unemployment in Oregon. His treatment of these two remedies for unemployment and especially his treatment of the shifting of public works, is a distinct contribution to applied economics. The material contained in this pamphlet if developed more at length, would make a handsome volume. Let us hope that Professor O'Hara may be able to give us such a volume in the near future.

JOHN O'GRADY.

---

**American Literature**, by William J. Long. Ginn and Company, Boston, New York, Chicago and London. Pp. 481.

Being in almost universal use it is perhaps a little late to object to the title *American Literature*. In thus styling his book the Reverend Doctor Long keeps step with a numerous company of writers both eminent and obscure. For the present we have histories of Scottish literature as well as of Irish literature which are not concerned with either the songs or the sagas of the Gael. There is likewise a considerable body of Canadian literature. Doubtless there will be South Sea Idylls for the entertainment of our children and for a more distant posterity Australasian anthologies. Indeed, this geographical principle of classification can scarcely avoid a literature of the Union of South Africa. Of course, this will not include the natural lyrics of the Hottentot, for on his melodies the conqueror has imposed everlasting silence. Nor need we seek in it a hint of the feelings or the sentiments of the Bushmen. That race is to be seen only in pictures. With a still further extension of British authority, a contingency by no means remote, new varieties of English literature are likely to mark the artistic phenomena of the future. *American Authors and Their Works* would sufficiently suggest the scope of this and of similar books.

Some such considerations as the preceding appear to have been in the mind of Dr. Long, for his book is described as *A study of the men and the books that in the earlier and later times reflect the American spirit*. This plan should exclude those authors who were undoubted products of British or other European institutions

and it should include the more noteworthy of American writers whether they labored in the field of pure or in that of applied literature. The subject-matter of this book is considered under the following epochs, namely: the colonial period, the period of the Revolution, the first and the second national period, and the present age. To these divisions, which are as good as any, no one can fairly object.

The first observation to be made concerning this work is that it is written in a style which is both clear and interesting, a style sufficiently elegant for didactic purposes and for the student a safe model for imitation. It shows that the author possesses fine critical ability and wide scholarship. Perhaps the next circumstance that impresses a mature reader is that in our favored Republic, as in other nations, political history has constantly influenced the development of literature. In this book their intimate relation is plainly indicated. The lists of representative historical works illustrating the successive periods add greatly to the value of the volume. The influence of the daily life of the American people on their literature is skilfully developed by fundamental questions and the knowledge of the student broadened by suggested themes. This research is the basis of all sound scholarship and it is well to begin it at the earliest practicable moment. The number and quality of the illustrations add much to the utility of the work. In a word, it is admirably adapted to the courses offered in high schools.

The author's treatment of the colonial epoch is unexceptionable. On page 24, note 2, occurs the expression "a historical record." In our opinion the rule requires *an* before the word *historical*. Page 29, footnote 1, has the plural verb *suggest*, which should be in the singular number. These and a few others to be mentioned are the slips to be expected in a first edition. *The Simple Cobbler of Agawam* is noticed in a complimentary paragraph, though elsewhere Dr. Long refers to its author, Reverend Nathaniel Ward, as one not in harmony with the growing spirit of toleration in New England. In a rather wide range of English literature we know of but one verse that adequately describes the author of the "Postscript" to the *Simple Cobbler*, namely, Marlowe's fine line, "a madman beating on a drum."

In discussing the birth of this nation, p. 92, the author, for the moment, leaves the field of literature, which he knows, and enters into a realm less familiar. Up to the meeting of the Stamp Act Congress there were in America thirteen English dependencies.

At that moment there came into existence something else. That new force marks the beginning of the American state. Concerning that beginning political science has no doubt. Page 121 refers, note 2, to the "Federalist Farmer." Richard Henry Lee signed himself a *Federal Farmer*. It is stated, p. 128, that Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* carry a suggestion of *The American Commonwealth*. If it was necessary to notice the work of Viscount Bryce, it should have been added that its plan was admirably sketched by Montesquieu and that in his preface the Irish author fully acknowledges his indebtedness to his illustrious French predecessor. In his interesting sketch of the literature of the era of independence Dr. Long, probably by following Tyler's splendid work, makes no mention of the letters of "*The First Citizen*." In our opinion Charles Carroll of Carrollton is worthy of at least a footnote. As a member of the Brook Farm and as an author in later times Orestes Brownson is worth considering.

With Shakespeare on one's side one should not hesitate to use the word *voice* as a verb, but one might object to its use a dozen times in one rather small volume. However, Dr. Long's style and diction are nearly always beyond reasonable criticism and to him, perhaps, the *voicing* of one's feelings does not suggest a political harangue. He has prepared a text-book that is practically faultless.

CHAS. H. MCCARTHY.

**Goethe.** Sein Leben und seine Werke. Von A. Baumgartner, S. J. Dritte, neubearbeitete Auflage, besorgt von A. Stockmann, S. J. Vol. I. Jugend, Lehr- und Wanderjahre. Von 1749-1790; 570 pg. in Leinwand \$3.25. (1912). Vol. II. Der Altmeister. Von 1790-1832. 742 pg. \$4.00. (1914). Herder, Freiburg, New York and St. Louis, 1913.

Father Baumgartner needs no introduction. His works, especially his "Geschichte der Weltliteratur," in six volumes; his treatises on Lessing, on Calderon, Longfellow, his "Stellung der deutschen Katholiken zur neueren Literatur" are too well known in Europe as well as in America to demand more than mentioning their titles. Quite the same reputation undoubtedly has his biography of Goethe.

The first edition of this thorough presentation appeared in 1882, the second and last in 1885. While the "Weltliteratur"

still is and for the near future, will be of greatest value, the "Goethe" biography by Baumgartner, owing to the ever-increasing number of extensive writings concerning this great poet and philosopher, was naturally for a modern student soon out of date and far surpassed by others. A Catholic scholar and general reader had, therefore, practically nothing from which he could get reliable and most up-to-date information on Goethe's life and works according to the principles resulting from his religious convictions. Expeditus Schmidt's "Attitude of Catholics toward Goethe" has too recently been published to be of help, intending, moreover, to be only a sketch of the Catholic conception of Goethe, the philosopher. The number of books dealing with Goethe from a quite different point of view than that of Baumgartner, in the meantime, had increased to such an extent that Father Stockmann in the introduction of the new work "Goethe" speaks of having had 4,000 titles in a card-catalogue on Goethe-bibliography, exclusive of magazine and newspaper articles, since the publication of the second edition.

Now Father Stockmann gives to the world this third edition of Baumgartner's "Goethe," and I am happy to say that it is a marvel of scholarship combined with greatest skill and learning in the handling of such a difficult undertaking. I venture to state that Stockman's "Goethe" in the present form is a model for anyone who contemplates the revision of a book written three decades ago, in as much as it gives on the one hand the latest data that scholarship has to offer us, and yet at the same time preserves the character and particular merits of the original. We must indeed feel very grateful to Father Stockmann for having brought this important book up so successfully to the level of the science of the day by inserting all the innumerable results of research which have been made during the last 30 years in this field.

Baumgartner's object of counteracting and checking the blind-folded and bigoted admiration—not to say adoration—which many of Goethe's disciples had conceived is unquestionably nowadays no less warranted and necessary than it was 30 years ago. New books continually are put on the market, articles are written month after month not only on Goethe in general; every phase of his life, every inch of his walking, the most insignificant details in regard to his life, birth, mother, relatives, friends, home, garden, his position as statesman, superintendent of the Weimar Theatre, his attitude to

children and education, etc., are treated in full and in the most elaborate and almost ridiculously trifling manner. All this great man said and did is being praised as a dogma of wisdom, of loftiest conceptions; is considered the only resort to supply religion and faith, serving as a guide and ideal for moral and intellectual life.

To prove this state of absolute subordination of the modern German literary world under the leadership of the new god, "Goethe," I need only refer to books like those of Dr. Wilhelm Bode, that all came out in the same year, 1912, as "Der fröhliche Goethe," or "Goethe's Leben im Garten am Stern," or "Goethe's Schauspieler und Musiker," or that of Ungenannt, "Das Buch von der Nachfolge Goethes" (Berlin, Meyer und Jessen, 1911), or partly those of recent biographers of Goethe as Eduard Engel (1909), Ludwig Geiger (1910), Jos. McCabe ("Goethe, the Man and His Character," Philadelphia, 1912), or those referring to Goethe's most intimate relations to female characters. One lady (Johanna Beckmann, "Aus Goethes Sonnentagen," Berlin, 1910), even divides her book, a collection of love songs of Goethe's, into chapters devoted each to one of the many sweethearts of her idol.

Such a book, then, as Father Stockmann's, giving facts and not imagination, is just the one that should reach the Goethe fanatics and bring them back to their senses. In comparison with the former editions, Stockmann has made very valuable and frequent additions. In many instances he abridges or omits passages that did not seem to him applicable to the present state of knowledge on this matter. Apparently his purpose in thoroughly revising the old Baumgartner is to suit it to modern ideas in form, expression and style, and to mitigate the somewhat striking first impression that Baumgartner left as being "narrow" and too one-sided. In every sentence, on every page, we can detect an improvement or at least a change in regard to the former second edition. His labors are based on deep and scrupulous research, on constant references to the sources, displaying his extensive reading and unremitting perseverance in correcting and comparing all the notes and quotations. No detail has been overlooked. In addition this new edition is much clearer in its composition. Stockmann not only takes care to separate certain passages that were formally given in a more or less confusing way, he also reduces to a fine academical style the rather harsh and coarse language of Baumgartner. Whether he succeeded fully in this I take the liberty to doubt. He, for exam-



ple, changes expressions like "entzückender Tod" into "theatralischer Tod," or substitutes "Wirrwar" for "Dusel" der Geniezeit." According to my view Stockmann unnecessarily gives too much consideration to the prevailing more refined taste in language and composition. In making these concessions he may have gone beyond the limits of necessity. At other times he reverses successfully certain chapters or gives them other names if it aids to the comprehension, conciseness or clearness of the book. Were Baumgartner to arise from the dead he would or should rejoice at these ameliorations and be proud of having found such an able revisor as Stockmann.

In short, we heartily recommend this work in which the entire literature pertaining to Goethe has been fully and remarkably treated in the light of Catholic ideals. It deals in a most decent manner with all the delicate situations and periods of Goethe's life. It may even be too careful and considerate in touching upon certain questions and happenings, omitting often events in Goethe's days of moral freedom that might have essential bearing on the final judgment of a Catholic regarding the great German poet. All in all, the book is of most aristocratic character in form and language. Even the binding is of more artistic finish, and is easier to peruse, consisting now of two volumes instead of three. We present our warmest congratulations, therefore, to the Herder Book Company, on their success in bringing out such a contribution to Catholic literature. The second volume that was published at the beginning of this year certainly deserves the same welcome that has already been accorded to the first in 1911-1912. It is greatly to be desired that the work should be translated into English. This should be in accordance with a general scheme of publishing and editing prominent monuments of German literature from a Catholic viewpoint. This heretofore has never been done, although the nineteenth century German literature boasts of having Catholic poets as Eichendorff, Brentano, von Droste-Hülshoff, Fr. W. Weber, Hahn-Hahn, von Brackel and others. Nor has Goethe's *Faust* ever been edited for American Catholic institutions of higher education. But—"Gut Ding will Weile haben."

PAUL GLEIS.

**Poems for Loyal Hearts.** By Rev. William Livingston. New York. P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1914. Pp. 173. Price \$1.25 postpaid.

I have read this book from cover to cover with pleasure unalloyed. Father Livingston has the soul of a true poet and a heart that will never grow old. He is, in the proper sense, the *vates sacer*, and withal he has that human touch whose appeal is universal. The poems are arranged in six divisions: In Hope Assured; In Living Faith; In Love Divine; In Freedom's Name; In Simple Tribute, and In Contemplation: and the grouping under each head is logically, as well as aesthetically, correct. Tenderness and love, piety and the blessedness of repentance are the dominant notes; but the minister of Him Who was always gentle unless when He rebuked hypocrites and drove the money-changers from the Temple, can blaze into wrath against injustice and wrong. Not since Elizabeth Barrett (not yet married to Robert Browning) sent "The Cry of the Children" to *Blackwood's Magazine* in the early forties and Thomas Hood electrified readers of the Christmas number of *Punch* in 1843 with "The Song of the Shirt," do I call to mind any poem that tackles modern sociological conditions more courageously than Father Livingston's "False Prophets." Here the evil tendencies of the present day and the erroneous methods adopted to remove them are described in words that, like a strong, undiluted acid, scorch their way along. And the remedy? A loyal son of Mother Church and devoted to her teaching and practice, Father Livingston boldly proclaims her divine mission and her inherent power to cope with what is dark in life and with a world gone all awry. He will not have it that "faith is a fossilized fraud," but that—

Oh! the lightning of tongue and pen  
 Must shatter the mask of lies  
 That the malice of Godless men  
 Is holding before men's eyes.  
 We must call to the surging crowd  
 That the Church and the Church alone  
 Can preach the truth to the proud,  
 And claim for the poor their own.

. . . . .

The Church and no other can teach  
 These millions of man-made slaves  
 The truth she was sent to preach—  
 The gospel of Christ that saves.

In each of the pieces which fall under the heading of "In Contemplation"—The Flight into Egypt, The Widow's Mite, Christ and the Children, and Feed My Sheep—the blank verse narration is delicately done, and the moral drawn grows so naturally out of the sweet stories that it seems in no way obtrusive but to belong naturally in its place. The singer's love for the land of his birth is so far from being extinguished that it waxes stronger because of his absence, as witness "This Irish Heart of Mine," "An Exile's Shamrock," and "Unbroken Vows." The lines to "Cardinal Farley" are on a worthy theme and are very beautiful: look at the splendor of the opening stanza:

Crowned with the glory of a golden hour  
That brought, amid the eternal hills of Rome,  
That gift divine, the Priest's almighty power,  
He turned his face to this far Western home.

Not less remarkable than the fulness and freshness of Father Livingston's thought is his technical power. He appears equally at home in many diversified metres. Sonnet, Spenserian stanza, elegiac stanza, the stanza of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, blank verse, the anapaest, the iambic quatrain—he writes all with equal facility and felicity.

The book ends with a prayer, the phrasing of which must, I think, be typical of the kindly heart of its author:

Draw from our tongues the sting of scornful words  
That wound the spirit in the dawn of hope,  
And plunge the soul in darker deeps again.  
Grant us to see with tender eyes like Thine,  
And hear with ears attuned to gentler airs,  
And speak with words that blossom in the sun  
Of that great truth which radiates from Thee.

The publishers, P. J. Kenedy and Sons, have done justice to the splendid content of this volume and clothed it in a tasteful and appropriate garb.

P. J. LENNOX.

---

**In the Heart of the Meadow and Other Poems.** By Thomas O'Hagan. Toronto: William Briggs, 1914. Pp. 47.

To this little collection there is a Foreword by the Hon. Justice Longley, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, in which the principal claims made are that Dr. O'Hagan's poems are easily understood because

they spring from the heart, and that they enshrine sweetest and purest sentiments. Much the same qualities appealed to one of my students, to whom I assigned this volume for practice in reviewing. This young man writes, among other things:

"Each poem is a gem of thought. It at once moves and elevates the soul of the reader to things spiritual. The personality of the highly-gifted singer is reflected in the poetry. Perhaps one of the most commendable features of the volume is the simplicity and directness of its verse, which place it within the immediate reach of the masses."

The claims thus put forward both by the distinguished judge and by the tyro in criticism are thoroughly substantiated by the verses themselves; but the whole case is then by no means stated. If it had been added that the poems are instinct with fancy and are of imagination all compact; that they display a mastery over many metres and voice many a shade of feeling, moving now sedately and now with a swing and a lilt, according to the mood to be expressed; and that patriotism as well as religion finds in them an appropriate outpouring, the mark would not have been overshot. Tenderness, piety, friendship, filial affection, love that conquers death and lasts beyond the grave, the call of the "Settlement," loyalty to the college that has been the poet's Alma Mater: all these we have, and not often in recent years have they been more poetically or more gracefully phrased. While Canada is the day-star of Dr. O'Hagan's devotion, he cherishes for the island which is the cradle of his race that undying love which is the characteristic of every one of Irish birth or blood in every clime. Let us take, for example, the following stanza, written on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1912:

Scattered your exiles on every sea,  
 Still they are kneeling in fervor and prayer,  
 Dreaming the dream that they dreamt of old  
 'Neath a star-sown sky of a life of care:  
 For this is a gift that kings ne'er give;  
 It cometh in daytime, it cometh at night;  
 'Tis a gift of God to the Irish race,  
 Oh, hold it enshrined, this wondrous light!

And see how he manages the anapaestic measure and with what facility he handles internal rhyme. This latter quality came to him hereditarily from his Gaelic forefathers. A stanza from the piece entitled "*Haec olim meminisse juvabit*" will illustrate:

We watch for the sails which were filled with the gales  
 That blew from the Islands of Youth;

What splendor of bark as it shot thro' the dark  
Towards the Lighthouse of Candor and Truth!

One of the most touching things in the book is a twelve-line *In Memoriam* addressed to my own good friend, the eminent Dominican, the late Father Albert Reinhart, whose untimely death all who knew him most sincerely deplore.

A writer in a recent number of the *Irish Catholic*, published at Dublin, in claiming the author of this little book of verse as a fellow-countryman and co-religionist, pays him the following tribute:

"Transplantation, at any rate, has not broken the strings of the Irish harp or dulled the voice of the minstrel! Dr. O'Hagan's poems will live."

I think it quite safe to endorse the tribute and adopt the prophecy.

P. J. LENNOX.

---

**The Black Cardinal.** By John Talbot Smith. New York: The Champlain Press, 1914. Pp. 360. Price \$1.25.

This is a brightly written and very interesting historical novel dealing with the period of the rise and fall of the great Napoleon. The story centres around Elizabeth Patterson of Baltimore and the fight she made for her rights as the wife of Jerome Bonaparte. The inflexible attitude of the Catholic Church regarding the sanctity of the marriage tie is on many occasions well brought out. The great dominating personality of the story is, not Elizabeth Patterson, nor yet Napoleon, but Cardinal Consalvi, whose rigid devotion to principle wins through in the end. The closing scene between him and Madame Patterson-Bonaparte, in which the great Cardinal predicts for her a place in history as significant as that of Mary Queen of Scots or Joan of Arc and exactly parallel with that of Katharine of Aragon, shows the writer at his best. There is a sub-plot, very well worked out, concerning the love affairs of the Marquis Andrea Consalvi and the Contessa Corona Franchi, and the reader, who has been kept on edge for a long time regarding their separation and differences, is glad to find that they are ultimately united. There is much humor of a sly order in many of the speeches of Elizabeth. It is altogether an exhilarating and refreshing novel and well worth reading.

P. J. LENNOX.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### Consecration of Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan as Bishop of Germanicopolis.

Monsignor Thomas J. Shahan, rector of the Catholic University, was consecrated Titular Bishop of Germanicopolis in the Baltimore Cathedral, Sunday, November 15, by Cardinal Gibbons. The assistant consecrators were Bishop Niland, of Hartford, and Bishop O'Connell, of Richmond. The sermon was preached by Monsignor Duggan, Vicar-General of the Hartford diocese. The titular see of Germanicopolis is in Asia Minor, in the mountainous province of Iscuria, and like many of the titular sees, is now a poor village of a few thousand inhabitants. It is of interest to the Catholics of the United States, having been successively held by Bishop Mullen, of Erie, and Bishop Koudelka, of Superior.

Monsignor Shahan was born in Manchester, N. H., in 1857, and received his early education in the public schools of Millbury, Mass., and at Montreal College. He was a student of the American College, Rome, from 1878 to 1882, in which year he was ordained a priest for the diocese of Hartford, obtained at the Propaganda the Doctorate in theology, and was soon made chancellor and secretary of his diocese. In 1889 he joined the staff of the Catholic University of America, then being organized by Bishop Keane, and after three years of historical studies at Rome, Berlin and Paris, returned to Washington to occupy the Eugene Kelly Chair of Ecclesiastical History. This post he occupied for 18 years, and meantime founded the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN, which he edited for 10 years, besides contributing to several reviews. He is one of the five editors of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, and is president of the Catholic Educational Association and of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, also National Chaplain of the Young Men's Catholic Union. He is a member of the Board of Judges for the Hall of Fame, New York City.

In 1909 he became rector of the Catholic University, and was made a Domestic Prelate of the Papal Court. He has written several works, "The Blessed Virgin in the Catacombs," "The Beginnings of Christianity," "The Middle Ages," "Saint Patrick in History," "The House of God," and other addresses and studies.

He also translated from the German Bardenhewer's important work on the early fathers of the Christian Church. Within the last five years Monsignor Shahan has seen the University take on a considerable growth. Four large and noble edifices have arisen, the Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Hall, the Dining Hall and Graduate Hall, the Engineering Building, and the Chemical Laboratory, now in progress of construction. Additional land has been purchased and the Summer School for our teaching Sisters and the Catholic Sisters' College have been called into successful life. The student body of the University has also grown in numbers, registering this year nearly 700, of whom over 400 are lay students, while the professorial body has grown from 28 to 80 teachers. If this proportion of growth be kept up in the near future, the University will realize, while they yet live, some of the great hopes of its original projectors and supporters. One of the last works of Monsignor Shahan is the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, a new and splendid church for the University, which it is hoped to build with the aid of the Catholic women of the United States, and for which shortly before his death Pius X gave to Cardinal Gibbons a substantial contribution, besides a beautiful Apostolic Letter, printed in the last issue of the *Salve Regina*, the modest little bulletin in honor of Our Blessed Mother, by which Monsignor Shahan makes known the progress of the monument in favor of the National Shrine.

#### PRESENTATION ON THE PART OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTIES.

On Friday, November 6, the Faculties of the University gathered in the Assembly Room of McMahon Hall and presented to the Right Reverend Rector a beautiful pectoral cross set with emeralds and diamonds as a token of the esteem and affection in which they hold the newly-appointed Bishop of Germanicopolis.

In the name of the Faculties, Very Reverend Doctor Aiken, Dean of the Faculty of Theology, read the following address:

Right Reverend Bishop:—

There are times and occasions when it is fitting that the esteem in which we hold a man of worth should find formal outward expression. Such a time has presented itself to us in your regard. When last June the news reached the University that the Holy See had seen fit to bestow on you the dignity and honor of the episcopate, it called forth expressions of satisfaction on every side.

We felt that the signal honor thus conferred on you was doubly gracious; first because it came unsought, and secondly because it was amply deserved. Most of us have had the pleasure of knowing you intimately for many years. Both as professor and as rector, you have given us a high example of untiring industry and of unselfish devotion to the University. And this activity and generous service have not failed to produce abundant fruit. Under your administration the University has been quickened to a life of vigor such as it never knew before. Several new buildings, both beautiful and imposing, have been erected on the campus. The number of students has increased by leaps and bounds. The teaching corps has been proportionately augmented. Thanks to your kind and just rule, our relations with you have ever been most cordial and friendly. Whenever we had need to approach you, it was with the confidence of finding that kindly consideration, that sympathy, that genuine interest that marks a true friend. And so, on the eve of your consecration, we have come together to give you a substantial token of our good will and esteem. This token will be the more acceptable to you, when I assure you that it represents the willing contributions, not simply of a large party, but of all the members of our various faculties; and not alone of these, but also of the numerous persons both clerical and lay, who are officially connected with the University. A gift from the heart, it has taken, not inappropriately, the form of a pectoral cross, to be worn near the heart. May it be to you for many years to come a symbol of joy and spiritual gladness, and let it be also a constant reminder of us on those numerous occasions, when as bishop of God's holy Church you will be called to perform the most sacred functions of religion. It is then with the greatest pleasure that we present to you this token of our genuine affection and esteem.

The Right Reverend Bishop responded appreciatively and feelingly, referring to his experience of twenty-five years as Professor and Rector of the Catholic University of America, and mentioning in particular the harmonious goodwill with which all his suggestions and rulings have been taken up by members of the teaching staff, for the benefit and progress of the University.

#### CEREMONIES AT THE CATHEDRAL.

Cardinal Gibbons presided at the exercises, which were attended by two archbishops, twenty bishops, many monsignori, a large



body of priests and representative Catholics of Baltimore and other cities.

The archbishops present at the ceremonies were: Henry Moeller, Cincinnati, and Edmond E. Prendergast, Philadelphia. The bishops present were: Francis S. Chatard, Indianapolis; Camillus P. Maes, Covington, Ky.; Maurice F. Burke, St. Joseph, Mo.; Joseph M. Emar, Canada; Michael J. Hoban, Scranton; Edward P. Allen, Mobile; Eugene A. Garvey, Altoona; Philip J. Garrigan, Sioux City; Daniel F. Feehan, Fall River, Mass.; P. J. Donahue, Wheeling, W. Va.; Edmund M. Dunne, Peoria, Ill.; Joseph J. Rice, Burlington, Vt.; John B. McGinley, Philippine Islands; John Ward, Leavenworth; Edward D. Kelly, Detroit; John E. Gunn, Natchez; Austin Dowling, Des Moines; John J. McCourt, Philadelphia, and Patrick J. Hayes, New York.

The monsignori present were: George W. Devine, William A. Fletcher, Michael F. Foley and James F. Donahue, Baltimore; Bernard J. Bradley, president of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg; William T. Russell, Washington; Joseph McNamee and Edward J. McGolrick, Brooklyn; N. F. Fisher and J. P. McDevitt, Philadelphia; J. B. Peterson, Boston; Thomas S. Duggan, Hartford; M. M. Hassett, Harrisburg, and F. H. Wall, New York.

Mgr. Fletcher, of the Cathedral, and Mgr. Russell, pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, were deacons of honor to the Cardinal. Mgr. McGolrick, of Brooklyn, N. Y., was assistant priest. Rev. W. Carroll Milholland, of St. Mary's Seminary, was master of ceremonies, with the Rev. James G. O'Neill, the Rev. V. E. McDonough and the Rev. J. S. McDonough, his assistants.

#### SERMON.

The sermon was preached by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Duggan, rector of the Hartford Cathedral.

"And He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors,—for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." *Eph.* 4-12.

Ten years ago when you commemorated the hundredth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of this edifice, it was announced that these sacred walls could claim the distinction of having witnessed the consecration of twenty-six bishops. Within this sanctuary, during the first century of its existence, six and

twenty prelates had reverently bowed their heads, the while the Pontiff held aloft God's anointing horn and poured out upon them the fulness of the priesthood, and from these historic portals they went forth to rule in the kingdom of Christ. The Mother Church rejoiced in her glorious fecundity and the faithful throughout the land partook of her maternal delight.

Most, if not all, of that illustrious company were appointed to exercise episcopal jurisdiction over a distinct portion of the American Church. He who is this morning elevated to the plenitude of the sacerdotal order enters another field, even the kingdom of knowledge, where, in fostering and directing the intellect of the flower of our Catholic youth, he will exercise one of the highest prerogatives and discharge one of the noblest duties of the episcopal office. Ordinary jurisdiction he has none. The name of his titular see recalls a chapter of ancient ecclesiastical history which is closed and which we shall suffer to remain sealed. His residence and his functions are in the realm of learning. There he will officiate as one having authority; there his duties will be as distinctively ecclesiastical, yea, as distinctly episcopal as divine decree can make them, for He calls some to be apostles, and some to be prophets, and some to be evangelists and some to be pastors and some to be doctors. In one point they all meet, in one respect they are all the same—they are all teachers: the apostle is a teacher, the prophet is a teacher, the evangelist is a teacher, the pastor is a teacher, the doctor is pre-eminently a teacher, or he is nothing. All these high functionaries are teachers, for the Church of Christ is first and fundamentally a teaching Church.

Nothing can exaggerate the importance, or, if you will, the preponderance of the sacramental system in the Christian economy. Without Baptism and Penance, without Orders and the Eucharist, the plenteous redemption bought for us by the death of Christ would disappear. Yet, without a teaching Church, these blessed means of grace would be abortive. Faith is preliminary to all these things, and faith requires a teacher. "How," asks St. Paul, "how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" "Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?" said Philip, as he ascended the chariot of the Ethiopian. "How can I, unless some man show me?" was the humble response. This shrewd man of affairs was so enraptured with the sublimity of Isaias that he read aloud the majestic periods; yet he was constrained to beg the

unknown wayfarer for light: "I beseech thee, of whom doth the prophet speak this, of himself, or of some other man?" And Philip opened his mouth, unfolded the Scriptures, preached Jesus, and led the eager disciple to the waters of regeneration.

There in perfect outline we have a picture of the perennial method of the Church of Christ: she instructs the intellect, she disposes the heart, she dispenses the mysteries of God. The Apostles themselves were living witnesses to the necessity of a teaching Church. The miracles wrought by our Lord consumed but a few moments of His time. He healed the ruler's son at the distance of a day's journey from the sick bed. He spoke and His wonders were accomplished. They touched the hem of His garment and were healed and made clean. He spent practically the whole of His public life in instructing His Apostles. They were in His company daily; yet after a tutelage of three years—the most memorable and most momentous in the history of the race, years in which were preached those wonderful sermons which have renewed the face of the earth and in which were unfolded those marvelous parables which have brought light and guidance to millions of groping minds—the Divine Teacher was constrained to deplore that His favored disciples were foolish and slow of heart to believe. Even after His resurrection, when they had beheld the temple of His body destroyed and rebuilt according to the promise, they turned to Him and implored: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" The kingdom of Israel, indeed! They were to conquer the world, and they were clamoring for the vanished glories of an effete and perfidious nation.

Nor is it strange that those rude men failed to comprehend the scope and magnificence of their vocation. They were but a handful and they were to be sent forth to preach and transform a world hostile and busy with its own schemes of aggrandizement. To the carnal-minded Asiatic and to the lustful African were they sent—to the keen and disdainful Greek and to the Roman drunk with conquest and reeking with the pride of intellect. Were such peoples to succumb to the arguments and exhortations of barbarian teachers from the dragnets and tax tables of Galilee? Had an elementary dictate of common sense been ignored? Had someone neglected to adapt means to ends? No; the Divine Master knew His missionaries and those to whom they were sent, and so He invested His Apostles with a miraculous power in order to compel the attention of the learned and the great, thus fulfilling one of

the most ancient of the prophecies: "I will provoke them to jealousy by that which is not a nation; by a foolish nation shall I anger them." They were indeed to fulfil the prophecy, yet, not they, but the Lord speaking through them: "Take no thought how or what to speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what to speak. For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."

But the age of miracles was soon to pass away; and the Church was to be left, under an inspiring and protecting Providence indeed, to teach by human means. The doctrines announced by Christ were so sublime and withal so revolutionary, so destructive of all that had gone before that it required a divine eloquence to bring them within the compass of intellects darkened by the principles and practices of pagan philosophy. But when the clean of heart beheld men and women of their own flesh and blood translating into their lives the most lofty precepts of the Gospel and rushing to death in vindication of their faith and sincerity, they too gave ear to the teachers, grace touched their hearts and they were constrained to cry out in exultation of spirit: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things."

A new luminary had taken its place in the moral and intellectual firmament. The sun of justice had risen. Heralds of the new dawn were not wanting—apostles and evangelists and doctors came forth for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry; but in whatever capacity they labored, they seemed to have written conspicuously before the mind's eye the compelling legend of the Apostle: "If I preach the Gospel, it is no glory to me, for a necessity lieth upon me: for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." To neglect the office of teaching would be for him to betray the Divine Master and to be guilty of high treason against the Almighty. In no other way can we explain the titanic labors of the great Bishops and priests and laymen who were heirs to the grace and the promises of the Apostles and who carried out so marvelously the divine commission to teach all nations.

As one recalls the struggles of the Apostolic fathers and their immediate successors, he must marvel at their infinite patience. Petty intellectuals thwarted them on every side. Mutiny was rife within the fold, and hair-splitting heretics lifted their piping notes above the multitude. They claimed and received the attention of

the great teachers who went on sowing the seeds of supernatural truth whence was to rise a new civilization wherein Christ should reign as Prophet, Priest, and King.

The transformation was to be gradual, imperceptible to the unreflecting multitude. The Church found paganism established throughout the Gentile world. She could not indeed hope to revolutionize the whole mass. The best she could do was to proclaim her doctrines and infuse them into the minds that were not altogether pre-empted by the tenets of the gods. She had to fight her way inch by inch from the banks of the Jordan to the Valley of the Nile, from the Temple to the Acropolis and from Mount Moriah to the Vatican hill. Monumental evidences of the intellectual conflicts of Christian antiquity are to be found in the great works which have come to us from the Fathers and Doctors. Pick up any one of their ponderous tomes and you will not read far without realizing that these great minds were engaged in an intellectual warfare which ranged from questions bearing on the nature of the true God down to a defence of the veracity of a thrifty and resourceful patriarch bent upon securing, at whatever cost, the benediction of his father and the birthright of his brother.

Nor did they enter the lists through mere love of combat. When you confront a man, or rather when you confront an empire, with the demand that they hate what they had hitherto loved and love what they had hitherto hated, but one of two ways is open to you: you must enter your demand and flee before the jeers and derision of the multitude; or you must stand and prepare to enter upon a long period of polemics and apologetics. The Christian evangelists made this astounding demand and stood their ground. If they presented to their disciples the book of the law, they were prepared to expound and defend its provisions; if they recalled a prophecy, they were prepared to show how it was verified in Him whom they represented and whom the Gentiles must accept as their Redeemer and Lawgiver. To interpret the sacred books and bring their teachings before the mind of the people in such a way as to overwhelm them with the truth and beauty of the Christian religion, was the chief care of the ancient Doctors. To meet the exigencies of the time, schools of Scriptural interpretation rose at Alexandria and at Antioch, from which evangelists went forth to preach to the legions sitting in darkness and the shadow of death.

It would be unpardonable pedantry to recall here the long cata-

logue of the names of those who became illustrious in this great warfare. Africa yielded her quota, Asia Minor had her conquests and her conquerors and so westward through Constantinople to Rome, where the Almighty had decreed that His kingdom should hold its capital and where mighty changes were to be wrought. In the early centuries the Church was forced to confine her educational efforts mainly to the training of the clergy and to the expounding of the Scriptures. But there was a Divinity which was shaping her ends. It was not necessary that Peter or Paul or James or John should share the secrets of the Most High—for who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been His counsellor? Rome was destined to unite the sacred and the profane, not by human premeditation or compact, but through the wisdom and the adorable design of Him who foresees and plans all things from the beginning.

Cardinal Newman in one of the greatest of his works makes bold to say that an instinct has guided the course of civilization. This instinct has decreed that, "Homer and Aristotle, with the poets and philosophers who circled round them, were to be the schoolmasters of all generations." Not even Rome, with all her pride of intellect, was proof against their influence. Her leading spirits, Terence, Virgil, Cicero, were to copy their Athenian masters and reproduce their philosophy, so that, when Greece waned, Rome fell heir to her vanished glory. Now, if Athens was the capital of secular knowledge, Jerusalem was the home and centre of supernatural religious light. Each, however, held its separate course. "Neither of them," says the Cardinal, "recognizes nor is recognized by the other. At length the temple of Jerusalem is rooted up by the armies of Titus, and the effete schools of Athens are stifled by the edict of Justinian. So pass away the ancient voices of religion and learning, but they are silenced only to revive more gloriously and more perfectly elsewhere. Hitherto they came from separate sources and performed separate works. Each leaves an heir and successor in the West, and that heir and successor is one and the same. The grace stored in Jerusalem, and the gifts which radiate from Athens, are made over and concentrated in Rome. This is true as a matter of history. Rome has united both sacred and profane learning; she has perpetuated and dispensed the traditions of Moses and David in the supernatural order and of Homer and Aristotle in the natural. To separate those two distinct teachings, human and divine, which meet at Rome, is to

retrograde; it is to rebuild the Jewish temple and to plant anew the groves of Academus."

Here, on the authority of the great Cardinal, do we find warrant for the Church's zeal for profane as well as sacred learning. She could not, in her infant weakness, annul the teachings of a thousand years of paganism. She had to take account of the immemorial traditions and inveterate prejudices of the people. And this she did, without abating one jot or tittle of that which is essential to the integrity of the divine deposit. But when the ancient society had crumbled from its inherent elements of decay and from the invasion of barbarian hordes, the work of reconstruction was to be made on a religious and Christian basis. From that hour, revealed religion was to have her voice in all education and all government. The sacred and the profane were to work hand in hand for the perfecting of the saints and for the edifying of the body of Christ.

It was possible for the Church to undertake this mighty work of reconstruction because almost from the beginning education had flourished under her inspiration. With her blessing religious men had segregated themselves from the crowd and had gone apart into quiet places in order to devote themselves to the meditation of spiritual things and to the pursuit of human wisdom. Now that both were to continue under the auspices and the official direction of the Church, schools began to multiply and to broaden their curricula in order to meet the growing demands of the intellect. Soon the university became not only a desideratum but a necessity. Cathedral and cloistered schools quickly developed and many of them became centers of universal knowledge. Young men, attracted by the fame of distinguished scholars, crowded to their halls in tens of thousands. Some were recognized as pre-eminent in one field, some in another. The young man, eager to excel in theology, sought to pursue his studies at Paris. If jurisprudence attracted him, Bologna was the goal of his wishes. If he sought eminence in medicine, Salerno haunted his dreams of ambition. We must not, however, conclude that any of the branches that had stood the test of time among the ancient and profane doctors were neglected. The humanities were duly appreciated and the old masters were preserved at the cost of infinite labor. Pope Gregory the Great, though sometimes accused of a want of admiration for the monuments of ancient literature, is said, by one of his biographers, to have supported the hall of the Apostolic See upon the columns of the seven liberal arts.

Viewing the world from the vantage point of the Papacy, the Pontiff never failed to recognize the opportunity and the duty of the Church of Christ. Whatever was necessary for begetting and fostering in the mind of the young a love of the good, the beautiful and the true, was judged to be within the province of the Church's legitimate endeavor, and nobly did Popes and Bishops address themselves to the work of propagating and inculcating every branch that was calculated to refine and elevate. Ecclesiastical benefices were incorporated with universities so that those who desired to devote their lives to the cause of learning could be placed beyond the anxiety of personal support. High privileges were bestowed upon professors and students, and the revenues at the disposal of the Holy See were judiciously divided between the schools and the missionary enterprises. In a word, Popes and prelates realized that the cultivation of the intellect in all its phases was an eminently Christian work, and that if the Church was to be true to her Divine Founder and to herself and equal to her opportunities, she must devote a considerable share of her magnificent energies to the cause of university education.

Rome led the way. Kings and emperors followed her illustrious guidance. When Charlemagne would build a Christian empire, he called to his side Alcuin of York, one of the greatest teachers of the age, and made him master of the Palace School. When Ferdinand and Isabella would unite Castile and Arragon and lay the foundations of one of the greatest monarchies that the world has ever seen, they worked hand in hand with the Archbishop of Toledo and placed at his disposal the first fruits accruing to them from their discoveries in the New World. Under the inspiration of the Cardinal and his sovereigns, Alcala rose stone by stone, hall by hall, so that ten years after the foundation of the university, when Francis I of France visited the great seat of learning and beheld its magnificent buildings and its ten thousand students, he turned to the Spanish monarch and exclaimed: "Ximenes has done in ten years what in France it has required a line of kings to accomplish." Before the middle of the sixteenth century, Europe could boast of no less than sixty-six of these great schools, not the least of which was to be found in the islands of the North and under the influence of religion and ecclesiastical doctors. Wolsey, whatever his faults, was true to the educational traditions of his Church. Shakespeare, when the fallen minister was safe from the snares of flattery, contributed measurably to his immortality by placing upon the lips of Griffith this splendid tribute:



"Ever witness for him  
Those twins of learning he raised in you,  
Ipswich and Oxford! one of which fell with him,  
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it;  
The other, though unfinished, yet so famous,  
So excellent in art, and still so rising,  
That Christendom shall ever speak his virtue."

Ere the imagination leaves the islands of the North, let us glance back at Europe, torn and trembling with strife and groaning under the colossal folly of her own children even as she once crouched and bled under the heel of the invading barbarian hordes. In the evil days of long ago, the Islands paid back the debt of gratitude which they owed to the Continent, to Rome and her missionaries. England, and more especially Ireland, sent forth her scholars who taught with unrivalled triumph in the great schools of Europe till Christendom stood transfixed with wonder that the barbarian Celt could speak with the tongues of men and angels. In these evil days they are sending forth, not scholars to enlighten, but soldiers to kill. And as we behold the ancient schools razed to the ground and the monuments of Christian art trembling to their foundations, we turn from the appalling spectacle of Vandalism and blood to this land so abundantly blessed by Divine Providence and so carefully guarded by the Spirit of wisdom. We turn to America and to the cradle of Catholicity in our beloved country.

You, my dear brethren, owing to the felicity of your easterly position, and to the grace of your fathers and founders, are privileged to behold the glorious traditions of Christian Europe renewed before the eyes of your flesh. Here a line of Bishops from Carroll to the Cardinal has championed the cause of Christian education. Here they began as their great predecessors had begun in the Old World, humbly but hopefully. Here they were supported and encouraged to noble endeavor by the sons of Olier and Ignatius, of Dominic and of Alphonsus, of Augustine and St. Vincent de Paul—all eager to spend themselves in teaching the faithful and in edifying the body of Christ. And when the prophetic souls of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council saw that the time was ripe for the establishing of a great national university, they manfully took upon themselves the great labor—with what success and with what earnest of growing achievement, you are well aware. But with this great enterprise, from its era of infant struggles to this

auspicious day, has been one that has spent himself and been spent for the cause. Thirty years ago his brilliant qualities and his splendid scholastic record recommended him to his Bishop, and he called him to his episcopal household. But just as Pope Damasus, for the common good of the Church, surrendered his claim upon the personal service of his secretary, St. Jerome, and suffered him to leave Rome and go to Palestine, there to complete those studies which were destined to prove of immortal service to mankind, even so did the Bishop of Hartford deprive himself of the precious assistance of his brilliant secretary in order that the eager student might return to the great schools of Europe and fit himself for a broader career at the Catholic University.

The Divine Master has said: "Where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also." The treasure and the heart of this rising scholar have been in the Catholic University. And when those who preside over the destinies of the great school sought a new rector, they fittingly selected for the learned post a Doctor: not a Doctor who had selfishly gathered unto himself and to his silent inner consciousness the treasures that unfold to the inquiring and industrious mind, but a Doctor who loved learning and because he loved it had striven with tongue and pen to extend its blessings to the race. They wisely selected for the office a man who has the imagination to behold the great and inevitable part which the Catholic University is destined to play in the upbuilding of the American Church—not a mere man of learning, that were nothing, for learning without enthusiasm, and a pregnant imaginative soul, is a dead thing. Varro, the most learned of the Romans, is forgotten, while Virgil is known to every school boy. These are the generous souls, the men of sacrifice, who earn and receive the benediction of the grateful. These are they whom the Church loves to honor. Now that such a one is at the head of our National University, and is also admitted to episcopal powers and prerogatives, we all feel a renewed sense of security. We all realize that our central school and its faculties are brought nearer to the chosen band that met the risen Savior on the appointed mountain in Galilee and received from Him, together with the commission to teach all nations, the promise of the abiding protection of the God of Wisdom. And as the river of knowledge flows from the rare heights of the University to us who labor in the denser atmosphere of the plane, it will bring with it the courage and benediction of added strength, for we know that should a base-born Philistine issue

forth from the camp of infidelity or irreligion to insult the faithful, there will not be wanting an intrepid David to rush to the stream, and gathering there the smooth stones of truth, cast them with divine accuracy full in the face of the enemy till he measure his uncircumcised length on the sand.

Right Reverend Bishop Shahan, may your years in the episcopate be many and fruitful; may you wear the mitre as meekly and as graciously as you have worn the Doctor's cap, and may the double crown of Pontiff et Doctor adorn your brow amid the shining company of those who shall have instructed many unto justice.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Reception in Caldwell Hall.** Sunday evening, October 11, the President of Caldwell Hall, Very Rev. Dr. Fenlon, gave a reception in the parlors of Caldwell Hall to the Faculties, and to the students of Caldwell Hall.

---

**Reception to Graduate Students.** On the evening of October 23 a reception was given in the parlors of Graduates' Hall to the Knights of Columbus Graduate Students. Words of cordial welcome were addressed to them by the Right Rev. Rector, Hon. Judge DeLacy and others, and an appropriate response was made, in the name of the graduates by Mr. Louis L. Roberts.

---

**The Shahan Debating Society** held its first meeting of the year in Graduates' Hall on Thursday, October 8. Father Tierney continues as moderator of the Society. The following officers were elected: President, Frank P. Barrett, Vice-president, George A. Kehoe, and Secretary-Treasurer, Michael G. Luddy. Regular meetings have since been held, on Thursday evenings.

---

**The Leo XIII Lyceum** has also found quarters in the new Graduates' Hall. It held its first meeting there on Tuesday, October 6. The following Saturday, the Lyceum held its annual reception, and since then has met regularly every alternate Tuesday.

---

**The Electron Society**, of the Engineering Department, held its first meeting of the year in the Engineering Building on Friday, October 23. The officers for the year are: President, Mr. O'Donnell; Vice-president, G. A. Murphy, and Secretary, C. A. Horn.

The Feast of the Immaculate Conception was celebrated by a High Mass in the chapel of Gibbons Hall, at which the Right Reverend Rector officiated. After the Mass the Faculties and students were entertained at dinner in the new dining-hall of Graduates' Building.

---

Mr. T. A. Daly, of Philadelphia, delivered a lecture on December 18 in the Assembly Room of MacMahon Hall.

---

Rev. Dr. Lucas, the first Doctor of the University, celebrated the Silver Jubilee of his priesthood in Scranton, Pa., on Sunday, December 13. The sermon was preached by the Right Reverend Rector of the University, and a large number of the Reverend Professors and Graduates of the University were in the sanctuary to pay a tribute of respect and affection to the Reverend Jubilarian.

# THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

Vol. XX.—No. 7.

December, 1914.

JAN 2 1915

Whole No. 109

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. IMPORTANT NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS	573
II. WASHINGTON, HIS ALLIES AND HIS FRIENDS	
Charles H. McCarthy	576
III. THE DEPENDENCE OF ST. JEROME ON ORIGEN	
J. L. Weidenhan, S. T. L.	594
IV. NEWMAN'S SERMONS AND THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC REVIVAL	
John E. Graham	606
V. BOOK REVIEWS	627
<p>GUILDAY, <i>English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795</i>,  <i>English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795</i>; MEAGHER, <i>The Protestant Churches</i>; POEY, <i>Manuel de sociologie catholique</i>; <i>Cours de doctrine et de pratique sociales</i>; KEYSER, <i>Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan</i>; HAGEN, <i>Realia Biblica geographica, naturalia, archæologica</i>; LATTEY, <i>The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures</i>; POPE, <i>The Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible</i>; LESÈTRE, <i>Le temple de Jérusalem</i>; GASQUET, <i>Breaking with the Past</i>; DE MATHEIS, <i>Predigten und Ansprachen zunächst für die jugend gebildeter Stände</i>; AIKEN, <i>Half-Hour with God's Heroes</i>; MADAME CECILIA, <i>From the Sepulchre to the Throne</i>; BELSER, <i>Johannes Evangelium</i>; D'ALÈS, <i>Dictionnaire Apologétique</i>; O'HARA, <i>Unemployment in Oregon</i>; LONG, <i>American Literature</i>; BAUMGARTNER, <i>Goethe</i>; LIVINGSTON, <i>Poems for Loyal Hearts</i>; O'HAGAN, <i>In the Heart of the Meadow and Other Poems</i>; SMITH, <i>The Black Cardinal</i>.</p>	
VI. MISCELLANEOUS	659
<p>Consecration of Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan as Bishop of Germanicopolis.</p>	
VII. UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE	673

WASHINGTON, D. C.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY

ISSUED MONTHLY FROM OCTOBER TO JULY

DECEMBER, 1914

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00

SINGLE NUMBERS, 40 CENTS

FOREIGN COUNTRIES, \$3.50

Entered as second class matter, December 23, 1907, at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, *etc.*,  
of *The Catholic University Bulletin*, published ten times a year at Wash-  
ington, D. C., required by Act of Congress of August 24, 1912.

Name of	Post-Office Address
Editor: Rev. William Turner, D. D., - - - - -	Washington, D. C.
Business Manager: J. Fendall Cain, - - - - -	" "
Publisher: J. H. Furst Co., - - - - -	Baltimore, Md.
Owners: The Catholic University of America, - - -	Washington, D. C.

(No stock issued.)

Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1  
per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other  
securities: none.

J. FENDALL CAIN,  
*Business Manager.*

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 2nd day of April, 1913.

[SEAL]

JOHN E. BENTON,  
*Notary Public, D. C.*



**MENEELY  
BELL CO.**  
TROY, N.Y.  
AND  
177 BROADWAY, N.Y. CITY  
**BELLS**

---

## WORKS OF FATHER SLATER, S. J.

**MANUAL OF MORAL THEOLOGY.** For English-Speaking Countries.

2 volumes, cloth, net, \$5.50

**CASES OF CONSCIENCE.** For English-Speaking Countries. 2 volumes  
cloth, net, \$3.50

**A SHORT HISTORY OF MORAL THEOLOGY.** 1 volume, cloth,  
net, \$0.50.

**THE FIVE VOLUMES COMPLETE, NET, \$9.50** For Sale by all Catholic Booksellers

## BENZIGER BROTHERS,

PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE

PUBLISHERS OF BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE

NEW YORK:  
36-38 Barclay Street.

CINCINNATI:  
343 Main Street.

CHICAGO:  
214-216 W. Monroe St.

---

# A HISTORY OF SIMONY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM THE BEGINNING TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE (814).

BY THE REV. N. A. WEBER, S. M., S. T. L.

8vo. Paper. \$1.50 net

### EXTRACT FROM THE PREFACE

"It is a well known fact that in the long course of the history of the Church, there has never been a period when she was free from struggles. From the very day of her foundation till the present time she has been obliged to wage relentless war against internal and external foes. Her internal conflicts were brought about either by the failure of certain individuals to receive the complete body of her divine doctrine or by violations of the moral law over which she was appointed guardian. The two great moral evils at one time affecting the clergy were incontinency and simony. Ecclesiastical celibacy and its violations have been frequently and extensively written about; but it may be safely said that, up to the present day, simony has not received from historians the attention which it deserves."

---

## A Commentary on The Decree "Ne Temere"

By VERY REV. JOHN T. CREAGH, J. U. D., LL. B., S. T. L.

Cloth, \$1.25, postage paid

The application of the Decree *Ne Temere* is a matter the seriousness of which is now appealing very strongly to every priest in the United States, and is not without a very real interest for the laity. It is therefore, a cause for general satisfaction that all will find in Dr. Creagh's work a simple and brief, but at the same time an exact and complete explanation of the new law.

J. H. FURST CO., Publishers, 23 Hanover St., Baltimore, Md.



# St. Mary's Academy,

CONDUCTED BY THE

**Sisters of the Holy Cross.**

(One Mile West of University of Notre Dame.)

Chartered in 1855.

---

**Confers Regular Collegiate Degrees.**

**FULL CORPS OF LECTURERS AND INSTRUCTORS.**

---

**ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT**

**Includes Carefully Graded Preparatory and Primary Courses.**

---

For Catalogue Address

**THE DIRECTRESS OF THE ACADEMY,**

**St. Mary's Academy,**

**NOTRE DAME P. O., INDIANA.**

# THE CATHOLIC WORLD

A Monthly Magazine of

GENERAL LITERATURE

Founded 1885.

Published by the Paulist Fathers.

RELIGION—ESSAYS—STORIES—WHAT THE WORLD IS  
DOING—THE LATEST BOOKS—THE FOREIGN  
MAGAZINES.

These subjects are treated by able writers regularly in the CATHOLIC WORLD.

WE SOLICIT YOUR SUBSCRIPTION.

Subscription Price.

\$3.00 per Year.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD,

120-122 West 60th Street,

New York City, N. Y.

---

## MANHATTAN COLLEGE

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS

NEW YORK

Incorporated 1863

---

BOARDING AND DAY SCHOLARS

---

Courses Leading to B. A. and B. S. (Engineering). Modern  
Languages, General Science, Pedagogy, and Commerce.  
High School Department.



# TRINITY COLLEGE RECORD

Published quarterly by the Senior Class of  
**TRINITY COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

**Annual Subscription \$1.00**

**ADDRESS BUSINESS MANAGER**

**TRINITY COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

---

**"We bespeak for 'The Trinity College Record' a warm welcome  
among all lovers of academic literature and augur for it a long  
career of usefulness and even distinction."—CATHOLIC  
UNIVERSITY BULLETIN, July, 1907.**

# **PARKER, BRIDGET & CO.**

**WASHINGTON'S LEADING**

## **OUTFITTERS FOR MEN AND BOYS**

**The largest and finest store devoted exclusively to Men's  
and Boys' Wear south of New York**

**Quality always the Highest**

**Prices as low as they can consistently be made**

## **PARKER, BRIDGET & COMPANY**

**Pennsylvania Avenue and Ninth Street, N. W.**

**WASHINGTON, D. C.**

---

### **The Advantages We Offer Our Depositors**

**Are such as cannot fail to inspire confidence. Our long and successful financial career—our large capital and surplus—our unsurpassed facilities; these are advantages which prospective depositors cannot afford to overlook.**

---

**Large and small accounts draw the same rate of interest.**

---

#### **OFFICERS:**

**WILLIAM D. HOOVER, President.  
E. FRANCIS RIGGS, Vice-President.  
WOODBURY BLAIR, 2d Vice-President.  
FRANK W. STONE, 3rd Vice-President.**

**GEORGE HOWARD, Treasurer.  
CHARLES E. NYMAN, Secretary.  
CHARLES C. LAMBORN, Assistant Treasurer.  
FRANK STETSON, Assistant Trust Officer.**

---

**National Savings and Trust Company**  
**Forty-third Year. Cor. 15th St. & N. Y. Ave.**

# RELIGION

---

**FIRST BOOK**—This is not a catechism.

It is a First Book in

*Religion,  
Reading,  
Nature Study,  
Social Science,  
Aesthetics.*

**SECOND BOOK**—This is not a theological treatise.

It is a Second Book in

*Religion,  
Reading,  
Nature Study,  
Social Science,  
Aesthetics.*

**THIRD BOOK**—This is not a Bible History.

It is a Third Book in Religion which presents in a concrete whole the dealings of God with His people through type and prophecy and their fulfillment in the life and works of Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church.

**LATER BOOKS**—The series of books on Religion will now present in more technical form the Dogmas of Catholic faith, the History, Laws and Liturgical practice of the Church.

**READERS**—In connection with the foregoing series a series of Readers, beginning with the third grade, is in preparation. These readers are based on the same general principles as the books on Religion; viz., the necessity of centering all education about the truths of Religion.

A series of Music Readers and text-books dealing with the elements of science will be provided at an early date.

## AUTHORS

Edward A. Pace, Ph. D., S. T. D., Professor of Philosophy in the Catholic University of America.

Thomas Edward Shields, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Education in the Catholic University of America.

**The Catholic Education Press,**

1026 Quincy Street,  
Brookland, D. C.

# The Catholic Educational Review

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

---

## CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER, 1913

<i>THE TEACHING OFFICE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH</i>	Thomas J. Shahan.
<i>THE TEACHING OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE COLLEGE</i>	Edward A. Pace.
<i>GROWTH OF THE ENGLISH DRAMA FROM THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH.....</i>	Sr. Mary Angelique.
<i>TWO EDUCATIONAL CONGRESSES AT VIENNA, HELD IN SEPTEMBER, 1912.....</i>	Lambert Nolle.
<i>IS THE DAM OR THE LEVEE STRONG ENOUGH...A Lay Teacher.</i>	
<i>THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF MUSIC.....</i>	Sister Mary Borgia.
<i>ROMANTICISM AND THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF GRACE</i>	Sr. Eugenia Clare.
<i>THE SUMMER SESSION OF TEACHERS COLLEGE— REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.....</i>	P. J. McCormick.
<i>CURRENT EVENTS</i>	<i>EDUCATIONAL NOTES</i>
<i>COLLEGES AND HIGH SCHOOLS AFFILIATED WITH THE UNIVERSITY</i>	

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATION PRESS

WASHINGTON, D. C.

*Monthly Except July and August*

YEARLY \$3.00. 14s. 6d.

SINGLE NUMBER 35c. 1s. 3d.

## **THE DIVINE STORY**

"I have read, and with deepest pleasure, every word of this life of our Lord for the young; and old as I am, I enjoyed it exceedingly and felt that it did me good." Archbishop KEANE.

To meet the persistent demands of Priests and Religious this "wonderfully attractive" life of our Lord by FATHER HOLLAND has now been made practical for MISSIONS, SCHOOLS, AND PREMIUMS by the publication of a

### **POPULAR PRICE EDITION**

Bound in cloth and illustrated, 50c.

Discount of 20% to purchasers of ten or more copies.

By mail, 53c.

Library Edition, handsomely bound and illustrated, postpaid, \$1.00

Ask your bookseller or send direct to

513 Westminster St.

**J. M. TALLY, Publisher.**

Providence, R. I.

---

## **Government and Institution Contractors**

---

Our Contract Department is in charge of an efficient force of highly trained experts.

Consult us for good results, no matter in what part of the world your buildings are.

The largest Furniture, Carpet, Drapery and Wall Paper house in the United States.

## **W. B. MOSES & SONS**

ESTABLISHED 1861.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

---



# Academy of the Holy Cross

---

A select school for young ladies and children, is prepared to impart a thorough education to those wishing to enjoy the advantages of an Academic, Musical, or an Art Course under competent teachers. No pains are spared to secure the most approved methods of instruction, and to reach a high standard in all that constitutes cultured womanhood.

FOR TERMS APPLY TO

**SISTERS OF THE HOLY CROSS**

Connecticut Ave. and Upton St., N. W.

Washington, D. C.

---

## LESSONS IN LOGIC

BY

REV. WILLIAM TURNER, S. T. D.,

*Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America.*

**A TEXT BOOK FOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES**

Price \$1.25

**The Catholic Education Press**

BROOKLAND, D. C.



# TRINITY COLLEGE,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

A Catholic Institution for  
the Higher Education of Women.

BEAUTIFULLY LOCATED IN THE IMMEDIATE  
VICINITY OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

---

Incorporated under the Laws of the District of Columbia  
with full powers to confer Collegiate Degrees, and  
registered by the University of the  
State of New York.

---

CONDUCTED BY THE  
Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur.

---

FOR PARTICULARS ADDRESS  
THE SECRETARY OF THE COLLEGE.









JAN 5 1961



